THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XI SEPTEMBER, 1925 No. 63

EDITORIAL

In *The Anglo-Catholic Movement To-day** Dr. Gore has disentangled with the greatest sympathy and skill the vital principles of this very vital element in the Christianity of our time; and this compact little treatise will come to many as at once a restraint and an inspiration. One of the most interesting chapters is that entitled "Some Necessary Modifications," where Dr. Gore shows how in three ways the movement has passed beyond the positions of the Tractarians. These are (1) the acceptance of the principle of Biblical criticism, (2) the recognition of the Church's responsibility in regard to social justice, and (3) the abandonment of the rigorist view of salvation which restricted it to those who were members of the one, visible, Church. One need hardly say how much is due to Dr. Gore himself and to the late Canon Scott Holland for this enlargement of the borders of the movement.

In pleading for a return to discipline and order in matters of ceremonial, Dr. Gore admits that borrowing from Rome has been almost inevitable owing to the jejune guidance which was all that the tradition of public worship in England supplied when the Oxford Movement began. But he asserts a principle which no one who believes in Catholic order can gainsay, when he writes: "There must be—there ought to be, under present circumstances—wide toleration of differences in the ceremonial setting of services; but every worshipper at any of the regular services of Mattins, Eucharist, and Evensong, at Baptisms, Weddings, and Funerals, ought to be sure of finding the prescribed service audibly rendered, and nothing else, except so far as the bishop, by public announcement, has felt himself entitled to authorize certain diversities." We only trust that the time is not far distant when a revised Prayer Book will render compliance with this principle a simple duty for all.

* A. R. Mowbray and Co., 1925.

THE BOOK OF WISDOM

In the oldest of the uncial manuscripts (ℵAB) this book bears the title of *The Wisdom of Solomon*, and, while it is obvious that the work is pseudonymous, it is worth while to enquire why this particular pseudonymity was chosen. To the Jews Solomon represented the outstanding exponent of wisdom, just as David represented the national hymn-writer. But it seems that there was even a stronger reason for the choice of the name. One of the objects of the book was apparently to counteract and correct the sensual materialism of an earlier book which also claimed the authorship of Solomon—Qoheleth, Ecclesiastes, which, in the opinion of the later author, did not present the true ideal of wisdom. And so he sets himself quite plainly (ii. 1-9) to combat what had been said, "reasoning not aright," in the earlier book. "Wisdom" was evidently the composition of a Jew living in Egypt and writing in Greek in the latter half of the century before Christ. Its theme is Σοφία, the Divine Companion and Emanation of the Most High; and in its description of Wisdom it shews affinity with some of the language of the Book of Proverbs, notably *Proverbs* viii. 22-31. It shews no acquaintance with either the thought or the writings of Philo. It contains no hint of the Logos doctrine which is prominent in Philo, and the conclusion seems clear that in the expression of Greek Jewish religious thought a σοφία doctrine preceded the λόγος doctrine, just as in Palestinian Jewish thought the Chokmah idea preceded that of the Dabhar, or Memra of the Targums; though it is probable that the idea of the Memra or Word of the Lord was tending to become more and more personified on lines somewhat parallel to the personification of the "Wisdom" of God as portrayed by the Alexandrian writers.

The phase of Hebrew thought which expressed itself in the Wisdom literature (says Dr. Cheyne) forms a "link between the more exceptional revelations of Old Testament Prophecy and the best moral and intellectual attainments of other nations than the Jews." It claims inspiration (*Sirach* xxiv. 33), but never asserts that its teachings are the peculiar property of one chosen race. All the forms of Wisdom are viewed as one in their origin. And its range of operation is world-wide. It "rains forth skill" of every kind. "The first man knew her not perfectly, no more shall the last trace her out" (*Sirach* i. 19, xxiv. 28). Nothing is too high and nothing is too low for Wisdom to "order fitly" (*Wisdom* viii. 1). Law and government, details of agriculture, astronomy and ethics are equally

her concern. The versatility of the mind of man is only an image of the versatility of the Divine Wisdom. The Hebrew sages were, in fact, philosophers, humanists, and realists. They were philosophers within the sphere of practical ethics: they were humanists in their freedom from national prejudice: they were realists as distinguished from the idealism of the great prophets.*

It is difficult, probably impossible, for us to think ourselves back into the condition of mind of a Jew, when the uniformity of Nature was not realized with all its colossal implications, and when credence was easily given to the report of anything happening because no one knew why or how anything did happen. Scientific facts were unknown; even scientific theories were barely suggested. Yet the Hebrews had a theory of the universe, and three theories of the origin of evil. But their cosmic philosophy developed on lines quite distinct from those on which pagan philosophy proceeded. This was due to their monotheism. The majesty and beauty of the universe were ascribed by the Jews at once and directly to the Power and Wisdom of God. They recognized no secondary causes. His Wisdom, His Spirit, His Word, were the instruments of creation and sustentation. Here we have a background of thought from which Christian doctrines emerged and were formulated. But these theological ideas were by no means uniform. Σοφία, Πνεῦμα, Λόγος passed through varying phases of interchange, and were only gradually differentiated. Σοφία and Πνεῦμα were often identified, as in *Wisdom* ix. 17. Sometimes Σοφία was viewed as the Mother of Λόγος. Later, in Christian thought, Λόγος took the place of Σοφία, as in the Johannine Prologue; and yet again, the functions of Λόγος and Πνεῦμα were sometimes not distinguished.

In the lost Jewish source of the Vision of the Woman and the Man-Child in *Revelation* xii. 1 *f.*, it seems probable that Πνεῦμα or Σοφία was portrayed as the Mother of the Λόγος. If so, that represents a very early strain of thought which correlated three notions—God, Σοφία-Πνεῦμα as the Mother, and Λόγος as the Son.† And this form of the doctrine of the Spirit survived so late as Afrahaṭ, the fourth-century Persian sage, divine, and bishop of the Jewish-Christian Mesopotamian Church. It is found also in the Gospel according to the Hebrews as quoted by Origen and Jerome, where our Lord is reported as speaking of His Mother the Holy Spirit, and she addresses Him as "My son."‡ This kind of primitive Christian

* Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, p. 118 *f.*
† Dr. G. H. Dix in *Journal of Theol. Studies*, October, 1924.
‡ M. R. James, *Apocryphal N.T.*, p. 2 *f.*

thought seems to reflect the earlier Jewish Wisdom teaching which distinguished Σοφία from Λόγος. The later tendency was to identify them. St. Paul in 1 *Corinthians* i. 24 calls Christ "the Wisdom of God," and he repeats it (verse 30, where "Wisdom" should have a capital letter), "Christ Jesus who was made unto us Wisdom . . ."

In the Book of Wisdom Σοφία is scarcely distinguished from the Πνεῦμα of God, and in ix. 17 they are practically identified: "Who ever gained knowledge of Thy counsel except Thou gavest Wisdom, and sentest Thy Holy Spirit from on high?" Σοφία and Λόγος, on the other hand, are not correlated by our author. They appear as separate hypostases of Divine activity. They differ in sex and in function. Σοφία represents the creative and beautifying energy of God. She is God's intermediary in the ordering and sustaining of the world. Λόγος represents the Angel of the Lord, the Warrior who rescues God's people and destroys their foes. Normally, however, Λόγος stands not for a hypostasis, but for an utterance of God's will manifested in action. To the Hebrew mind the conception of abstract reason or thought was quite foreign; and if thought was realized at all, it was in the form of "Word," its outward expression. Indeed, the Hebrews had such vague and indefinite notions of personality that it is useless for us to try to find parallels to modern thought in the Book of Wisdom about the nature of man, the pre-existence of the soul, and its life after the death of the body.

The influence of the Sapiential literature of the Jews on the writers of the New Testament has been increasingly recognized by scholars in recent years. Almost every commentary on the New Testament books gives references to passages in the older writings that are either parallel to the thought or directly responsible for it, sometimes even verbally. And not the least influential of these books is the Σοφία Σαλωμῶνος. I will endeavour to illustrate this, as briefly as may be, so as to shew how profoundly the Wisdom literature and more particularly the "Wisdom of Solomon" influenced the thoughts of the New Testament writers, and how widely and deeply it has penetrated into our own devotional, and even secular, compositions.

A comparison of the lines of thought, as well as some verbal coincidences, in St. Paul's Epistle to the *Romans* i. 20-29 with *Wisdom* xiii., xiv., gives clear indications of the Apostle's intimate acquaintance with the Book of Wisdom. The parallels are set out fully in Sanday and Headlam's commentary, and I need not do more than mention the main points dwelt upon in similar language by both writers—namely, men's refusal to obey the

teachings of natural religion, their lapse into idolatry, and the consequent catalogue of gross vices. As St. John Thackeray says, "The train of the argument exhibiting the various stages in the deterioration of the heathen world is clearly the same in Wisdom and in St. Paul."*

Again, in *Romans* ix., the arguments follow the same course as in *Wisdom* xi., xii. Both writers profess to give what is in their view a philosophy of history. Divine Wisdom is the overruling Power in the world, and this is illustrated by the typical instances of the Israelites and the Egyptians, of Moses and Pharaoh. The irresistibility of the Divine Power is insisted upon in almost identical language, and the example of the potter and the clay is adduced by both writers, who also alike lay stress upon the forbearance and long-suffering of God.

Then again, St. Paul's language in 1 *Corinthians* ii. 6-16 about the necessity of the Spirit for the understanding of spiritual things is very similar to that of *Wisdom* vii. 22 *f.*, ix. 6, 9-17; and in 1 *Corinthians* vi. 2 and *Wisdom* iii. 8 we find the same idea of the righteous judging the world.

The passage in 2 *Corinthians* v. 1-9 seems to have been strongly influenced by *Wisdom* ix. 10-19. No doubt the metaphor of the earthly tabernacle and the idea of the body weighing down the soul are common enough with Platonists and Stoics, but the verbal coincidences are striking throughout these two sets of verses; and it is worth noting that σκῆνος for a tabernacle occurs only in these two passages in Biblical Greek.

Especially clear is the indebtedness of St. Paul to *Wisdom* v. 17 *f.* for the idea of the πανοπλία of God, which he speaks of in *Ephesians* vi. 11 *f.;* which is not, as is so often misrepresented, the armour which God supplies, but the armour which God Himself wears. Doubtless the germ of the idea is to be found in *Isaiah* lix. 17, "He put on righteousness as a breastplate, and an helmet of salvation upon his head"; but the word πανοπλία and the fuller details came to St. Paul through *Wisdom:* "He shall take his jealousy as πανοπλίαν, . . . He shall put on righteousness as a breastplate . . . judgment as a helmet . . . holiness as a shield . . . stern wrath for a sword." It was a favourite thought with the Apostle, which appears in 1 *Thessalonians* v. 8, "putting on the breastplate of faith and love, and for a helmet the hope of salvation"; and again in 2 *Corinthians* v. 7, "by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left."

Moreover, the great Christological passage in *Colossians* i. 15-17 is verbally indebted to the terms in which the Divine

* *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought,* p. 224.

Wisdom is described in *Wisdom* vii. 22 *f.* and ix. And if we turn to the splendid phrases at the beginning of the Epistle to the Hebrews we find that these too are matched in *Wisdom* vii. The ἀπαύγασμα, the Radiance or Reflexion of the Eternal Light, the Mirror of the Divine Activity, the Image or the Imprint of God, are all there.* Other loans may be detected in the description of the Word of God as "sharp and penetrating" (*Hebrews* iv. 12), and in the phrase τόπον μετανοίας (xii. 17 from *Wisdom* xii. 10). St. John's description of the Eternity of the Word, His existence with God, His instrumentality in Creation, His tabernacling with men, His πληρῶμα, or Fullness, His uniqueness as Μονογενής, all come from the Wisdom sources. Wisdom's invitation in *Sirach* xxiv. 19, "Come unto Me all ye that desire Me," and, "Put your neck under her yoke" (li. 26), suggest to us words of Christ that are familiar to us all. The spirit of the command in *Sirach* xxviii. 2, "Forgive thy neighbour the hurt that he hath done thee, and then thy sins shall be pardoned when thou prayest," is incorporated both in the Sermon on the Mount and in the Lord's Prayer. It is extremely probable that a passage from a lost book of Wisdom literature is quoted in *Matthew* xxiii. 34, "Therefore, behold I send unto you prophets and wise men and scribes"; for in the parallel passage in *Luke* xi. 49 the words are expressly ascribed to the Wisdom of God—"Therefore also said the Wisdom of God." The initial word "Therefore" is part of the quotation, and has no force in its immediate context in the Gospels. Moreover, the succeeding apostrophe: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets and stoneth them that are sent unto her! How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" (*Matthew* xxiii. 37; *Luke* xiii. 34) is probably another citation from a Wisdom writing. The figure of the bird and her nestlings is most appropriate in the mouth of Wisdom, while in 2 *Esdras* i. 28 *f.*, we find exactly the same words put upon the lips of God: "Thus saith the Lord Almighty . . . I gathered you together as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings; but now, what shall I do unto you?"

Once again, the curious subject of "the elements of the world" (τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου), whatever St. Paul meant by that phrase, whether elemental spirits, dæmons, false gods, or what not, is paralleled in *Wisdom* vii. 17, xiii. 2 *f.*, xix. 18-21, and must at any rate find illustration there. St. James again most certainly came under the influence of this book, and, as

* It has been suggested that in *Hebrews* i. 1, 2 Λόγος is purposely avoided as a title of the Son, because in Philo λόγος and λόγοι were emanations, the latter term λόγοι being used of the angels.

himself an admirable exponent of the wisdom of practical piety, he owed much to our author, though in his case the coincidences are rather of thought than of word.

I am not sure whether or no the statement in *Wisdom* vii. 17 that "immortality consists in kinship unto Wisdom" (ἐστὶν ἀθανασία ἐν συγγενείᾳ σοφίας) can be pressed into meaning that eternal life begins on this earth; for in verse 13 the writer seems to make his ἀθανασία consist in the lasting memory which he leaves behind him; but if more than this be meant, we have here a remarkable anticipation of *John* xvii. 3, where eternal life is said to consist in the knowledge of God. The same thought recurs in *Wisdom* xv. 3, where knowledge of the power of God is described as the root of immortality (ῥίζα ἀθανασίας).

Nor do I feel certain that ἕτοιμον ἄρτον ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ in xvi. 20 is echoed in the ἄρτον ἐπιούσιον of the Paternoster, though there may be a reference to this passage in the discourse on the Manna and the Living Bread in *John* vi. 32 *f.* Has xvi. 28 δεῖ φθάνειν τὸν ἥλιον ἐπ' εὐχαριστίαν σοῦ καὶ πρὸς ἀνατολὴν φωτὸς ἐντυγχάνειν σοι ever been quoted in support of the *ante lucem* Christian assemblies (*cœtus antelucani*) for Eucharistic worship? If εὐχαριστίαν here refers to the manna, the Johannine discourse is further illustrated.

One more instance in the New Testament and I pass to later writers. In *Revelation* xix. 11-15 the picture of the Conquering Hero, the Warrior-Logos, is derived from *Wisdom* xviii. 15: "Thine all-powerful Word (ὁ παντοδύναμός σου Λόγος) leaped from heaven out of the royal throne, a stern warrior . . . bearing as a sharp sword Thine irrevocable commandment, and standing, it filled all things with death." One may suspect that the original literary source of this figure is to be found in the *Iliad* i. 43 *f.*, where Phœbus Apollo descends in anger from the summits of Olympus to strike death into the camp of the Greeks.

Sapiential titles of Christ borrowed from *Wisdom* vii. 22 *f.* are recognizable frequently in post-New Testament writers, and primitive Christology often made use of them. For instance, the figure of Christ as the Spotless Mirror (κάτοπτρον ἀκαλίδωτον) is found in the *Odes of Solomon* (xiii.), and in a tract falsely ascribed to Cyprian (*de montibus Sina et Sion*, 13), and in Theognostus, the third century Alexandrian Teacher.*

"Behold, the Lord is our Mirror," says the Ode. And Pseudo-Cyprian: "The Saviour is called the spotless Mirror of the Father. . . . And we too who believe Him see Christ in us as in a mirror." One is reminded of St. Paul's words in 2 *Corinthians* iii. 18, "We all with unveiled face, mirroring

* *Three Teachers of Alexandria*, p. 23, by L. B. Radford.

back (κατοπτριζόμενοι) the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image (τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα)." But Theognostus picks out some more of the terms used of Wisdom and applies them to Christ. Ἀτμίς at first sight is not a term that one would expect to find as a title of Christ, though in *Wisdom* vii. 26 it is used of Wisdom as "a Vapour (or Breath) of the Power of God." Theognostus says (*apud* Athanasius *de decretis Nicæni synodi*), "He was born of the substance of His Father as the ἀπαύγασμα from the light and as the ἀτμίς from the water. . . . Christ is an ἀπόρροια (effluence, emanation) from the substance of the Father." The same interpretation recurs in Dionysius of Alexandria (*apud* Athanasius *Epist. de sent. Dion.*, xv.): "Since God is light, Christ is ἀπαύγασμα, and since God is Spirit, Christ is analogously called ἀτμίς, for He is the Breath (or Vapour) of the Power of God."

Origen, indeed, asserts, reasoning in the reverse order, that all these Sapiential titles properly belong to Christ, and were only Wisdom's titles because they were His (*de prin.*, i. 2, 5).*

From the end of the first century onwards the Christian Church very highly esteemed the Σοφία Σαλωμῶνος, and exploited its language, using it as a mine whence to extract gems of devotion and hymnody.

The Introit for the Sunday within the octave of Christmas in the Roman Missal boldly adopts the words of *Wisdom* xviii. 14, "While peaceful silence enwrapt all things, and night in her own swiftness was in mid course, Thine all-powerful Word leaped from heaven out of the royal throne, a stern warrior, into the midst of the doomed land." And to this picture of the midnight silence Milton owed some verses in his hymn "On the Morning of Christ's Nativity":

> No war or battle's sound
> Was heard the world around.
> * * * *
> But peaceful was the night
> Wherein the Prince of Light
> His reign of peace upon the earth began.

Services for the Commemoration of Benefactors usually begin with sentences from *Wisdom* iii. 1, "Justorum animæ in manu Dei sunt: nec attinget eos cruciatus."

One of the Advent antiphons for the Magnificat, marked in our Kalendar as *O Sapientia* on December 16, is directly taken from *Wisdom* viii. 1, and *Sirach* xxiv. 3: "O Wisdom, which camest out of the mouth of the Most High, reaching from one end to another mightily, and sweetly ordering all things, come and shew us the way of understanding."

* Rendel Harris, *Origin of the Prologue to St. John*, p. 52 *f.*

Some of these uses shew how the earlier term Σοφία for Christ persisted even after Λόγος had come to its side, or in fact had generally replaced it. It had passed into the rituals of the Church and still exists there.

Let us come to mediæval and later times. Bernard of Cluny in his massive poem *De contemptu mundi*, beginning *Hora novissima, tempora pessima*, turns to *Wisdom* ii. 1 for his *Hic breve vivitur*, which perhaps we do not always remember when we sing it in Dr. Neale's translation:

> Brief life is here our portion,
> Brief sorrow, short-lived care;

nor recognize that the origin of the words is Ὀλίγος ἐστὶ καὶ λυπηρὸς ὁ βίος ἡμῶν.

Shakespeare, through the mouth of Hamlet, condenses *Wisdom* xvii. 11, "For wickedness, condemned by a witness within, is a coward thing, and being pressed by conscience always forecasteth the worst lot," into "Conscience does make cowards of us all."

Milton, again, in "Paradise Lost," i. 500:

> When night
> Darkens the streets, then wander forth the sons
> Of Belial, flown with insolence and wine,

provides an exact equivalent of Wisdom's "Let us fill ourselves with costly wine and perfumes, and pass through every meadow in our debauch: let none of us fail to take part in our insolent revelry" (ii. 7 *f.*).

Nor, when we read *Wisdom* ii. 8, "Let us crown ourselves with rosebuds before they be withered," can we fail to quote Herrick's

> Gather ye rosebuds while ye may,
> Old Time is still a-flying;
> And this same flower that smiles to-day,
> To-morrow may be dying,

even though the English poet may have been more directly indebted to Ausonius, 361, 49,

> Collige, virgo, rosas, dum flos novus et nova pubes,
> Et memor esto ævum sic properare tuum—

verses quoted (where Herrick probably saw them) in Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, iii. 2, 5, with the gloss, "A virgin is like a flower, a rose withered on a sudden. Let them take time, then, while they may, make advantage of youth."

I conclude with calling attention to one exquisite phrase which gave to Charles Wesley the first line of his best-known hymn, "Jesu, Lover of my soul." It comes from *Wisdom* xi. 26, "Thou sparest all things, for all are Thine, O Sovran Lord, Lover of the soul." Φείδῃ δὲ πάντων, ὅτι σά ἐστι, Δέσποτα Φιλόψυχε.

T. Herbert Bindley.

THE REVISED LECTIONARY

In this paper* I write from the standpoint, not of the expert, but from that of the ordinary parish priest. I venture to think that that is a point of view deserving of more consideration in the revision of the Prayer Book than it has received. For it is the parish clergy who far more than any others will use the new Prayer Book; and they know far better than the academic scholars and the highly placed clergy (including retired bishops) what are the practical defects of the present liturgy, and the real needs of the people. By all means let the experts be at hand to correct our mistakes, and curb our aspirations, when misdirected; but let the voice of those who have to minister day by day in our town and country parishes be the predominant voice.

A.—Improvements in the Revised Lectionary.

Let me first call attention to some new features of the Revised Lectionary which in the main seem to be improvements.

1. The week-day course is now governed by the ecclesiastical instead of the civil year—*e.g.*, the Lessons for this evening are determined not by the day of the month (May 27), but by the day of the Ecclesiastical Year (Tuesday after Rogation Sunday). This is as it should be for two reasons—(*a*) It is seemly that the Church year, and not the civil, should control the Church's method of reading the Bible. (*b*) The week-day series of Lessons is no longer interrupted, or rather mutilated, by the occurrence of the Sundays.

2. Proper Second Lessons are provided for all Sundays, and Proper First and Second Lessons for all Holy Days, morning and evening, and also for the Evensong of their Eves.

3. The Gospels may now be drawn upon for all, or nearly all, Sunday Second Lessons.

4. Many excellent selections for particular days must be passed over, but a happy arrangement for the week-day course must be mentioned—viz., the reading of the Acts of the Apostles during Eastertide and of the Epistle to the Hebrews during Ascensiontide.

5. In certain chapters one or more verses are to be omitted, as inappropriate for public reading. The principle might, I think, have been carried further, and in certain cases have provided a way out of the difficulty of dealing with passages which as they stand are too long for public reading and yet too

* A paper read at the Canterbury Clerical Society on May 27, 1924.

good to be excluded from the Lectionary. Examples of such passages are to be found in the histories of Joseph, David, and Elijah, and perhaps in 1 Corinthians xv., and even in the story of the Passion. But the best occasions for the principle of omission to operate would be in those passages where there is a good deal of repetition, or in which long lists of names occur, or in which matter of little interest for *public* reading is introduced.

Here let me emphasize a point to which too little attention has been given—viz., that Scriptures which may be profitable for private reading are not necessarily suitable for reading to mixed congregations in church. Many passages of the Bible are very difficult to follow, even if well read, and many more contain moral or scientific difficulties which only the more enlightened may be able to receive without stumbling, or are of such a nature that they are not likely to yield much that will be edifying to ordinary people. Many narratives too (*e.g.*, that of the Passover in Exodus) are *as mere literature* not very inspiring or calculated to arrest and keep the attention of the hearers. This being the case, true reverence for God's Word, as well as common sense, should teach us the wisdom of reading in public only such passages as are likely to be helpful and useful to the average man and woman. Very much must be omitted in any case. Why, when there is such an ample store upon which to draw, include Lessons which may offend the weaker brethren, or which may bore instead of edify, because what is read is unintelligible, or without any obvious interest or importance for people of this age? For different reasons, then, I should be inclined to exclude, from the Sunday course at least, the story of the Flood, of Jacob's deceit, of Jael and Sisera, of Balaam's Ass, etc.; and I often wonder what the people make of the tremendous denunciations of the Prophets against idolatry which are so often read to them, and whether some of the very difficult and argumentative chapters of St. Paul and of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as well as obscure passages of the Prophets, might not give place to Scriptures more obviously helpful and practical. In a word, may not the public reading of the Bible become almost a superstition, like speaking "with tongues" of old? If the Church does not receive edification by what we deliver from the Lectern, where is the profit? And what spiritual value is there in our proud Anglican boast that we have an open Bible, and that we read out of it to the people more than any other Church in Christendom?

B.—Criticism.

1. *Blunders.*—No two persons would agree as to the best Lessons in every case, so that nothing more need be said about any particular Lesson being included or excluded, whatever preferences or opinions on the matter we may have. But there seem to be some real blunders in the New Lectionary. For example, we have (in the latest Kalendars*) the Gospel for Easter Day read a second time in the evening Lesson. And at Christmastide within one month Isaiah xlix. is drawn upon for no less than five Sunday and Holy-day Lessons, three of which are precisely the same.

2. *Long Lessons.*—On the whole the Sunday Lessons are now shorter, but too many are still of inordinate length. Something has been said as to one way of dealing with long Lessons which *must* be included—namely, by the deletion, when possible, of some of the verses. I would only add that if one Lesson is long and cannot be curtailed, the other should be very short. The Psalms too might be chosen partly with reference to the length of the Lessons.

3. *Morning and Evening Courses Interdependent.*—On Sundays *generally*, and on week-days *sometimes*, the Old Testament morning and evening Lessons form a sequence; for example, if there is Genesis i. in the morning, Genesis ii. follows in the evening. The two courses are not distinct, but closely related. (The New Testament courses, on the other hand, are usually on Sundays, if not always on week-days, quite distinct.) What is the objection to this correlation of Scripture readings? The very practical one that most people in these days do not attend both Mattins and Evensong. As the old Lectionary apparently proceeded on the assumption that most people would be in church on week-days as much as on Sundays, so in the new—betraying thereby the detachment of its authors from the common life of the Church—the provision is evidently for congregations who go to church twice every Sunday at least. It may be said—"People can go twice, and ought to do so, as a rule. The Church cannot alter her arrangements to suit the convenience of a non-churchgoing age." This may be ideal, but is it prudent? Nay, is it right to punish people for their negligence as worshippers by withdrawing from them many of the very best Scriptures? For that is what it amounts to under the present scheme. *The great majority of regular worshippers will never hear in church some of the choicest portions of God's Word.* I may add that even for those who attend both

* This mistake does not appear in "Revision of the Lectionary" Convocation Report, No. 501 (S.P.C.K.).

the morning and evening services it would not be a disadvantage to hear at Evensong a different part of the Bible from what was read at Mattins.

4. *Provision of many more Alternatives.*—The word "alternatives" is one of the obsessions of our revisers. We are offered alternative prayers for all kinds of objects, alternative endings to Evensong, alternative psalms for Holy-days, alternatives in most of the sacramental offices, and we are even threatened with an alternative Prayer Book. So it is not surprising to find in the new Lectionary many more alternative Lessons. On Sundays there is usually a choice both at Mattins and Evensong, and in regard to both Lessons—*usually*, I say, for on certain Sunday mornings (Septuagesima, fifth and sixth in Lent and Easter Day, and when the Prophets are put down for reading) there is no choice. It is not easy to understand why a distinction so unfavourable to the Pentateuch and to the historical books of the Old Testament should be made.

But why have alternative Lessons been provided at all? The Joint Committee in their Report tell us that in so doing they were "influenced by a desire (*a*) to meet the needs of different types of congregation; (*b*) to provide a certain amount of variation for successive years; (*c*) to make it possible for congregations to hear in church on Sundays selections from the less familiar parts of the Old Testament and from some books of the Apocrypha." So with regard to the Sunday First Lessons, as to the Sunday Second Lessons, they give again as one main reason for providing alternatives their desire "to give variety for successive years and for congregations differing in character." Let us examine these two pleas:

(i.) *The Needs of Different Types of Congregation.*—But do congregations differ so much? The members composing them differ—some are richer or better educated than others; and the proportion of well-to-do or cultured persons varies greatly in different places. But I should have thought that there are usually all sorts and conditions of men and women in all congregations; and, further, that whatever differences there may be between the members of a congregation, the spiritual needs of all are much the same. I am at a loss, therefore, to understand what are the peculiar needs of certain types of congregation—that they have to be catered for by special Lessons. Surely it is not suggested that some Church people and their clergy are so unbelieving or so fastidious that certain portions of the Bible must not be read in their churches, though admitted elsewhere.

But granting that congregations differ so much as to require special provision to be made for them, will their needs be met by

alternative Lessons? I think not; at least, if the wishes of the revisers are carried out. For they are insistent in urging that the choice between alternate Lessons should "not be made capriciously, but according to some definite principle or plan"—which means, I suppose, that if the first of the two passages is read one year, the second should be chosen the next year. But almost certainly this "earnest hope" of the revisers will be for the most part ignored. And if so, how will the alternative lections minister to the peculiar needs of particular congregations? It is highly probable that much the same Lessons will be read in the same church year after year.

(ii.) *Variety.*—Experience of how it fared with the alternative Lessons provided in the old Lectionary for the Sunday Evensong should have taught the revisers that *in practice*, whatever alternatives are given, the choice is likely to fall upon the same passages year after year. For example, if there are two First Lessons for the morning or evening, and one is preferred this year as being rather shorter perhaps, or as being judged more interesting or edifying, is it not almost inevitable that the same considerations will govern the choice in succeeding years? In a word, the only result, so far as I can see, of loading the Kalendar with these additional Lessons will be that many Scriptures, excellent in themselves but regarded as slightly inferior for the purpose of public reading, will never be heard by most congregations at all. And, further, inasmuch as most people do not attend both Mattins and Evensong, and the Sunday morning Lessons are never read in the evening, and *vice versa*—there will under this scheme not only be little or no variety in any particular congregation, but the presence of the alternatives will operate in practice to the exclusion of some, at least, of the best parts of the Bible. To give an illustration. On the ninth Sunday after Trinity there are three alternative First Lessons for Evensong—1 Kings xviii., 1 Kings xix., and Wisdom xii. 12-21. Putting on one side the last (from the Apocrypha), it will be agreed that the two passages from Kings are admirable Lessons, and equally deserving to be read. But one is twice the length of the other. Is it not probable that the shorter one will generally be chosen? And that the splendid story of Elijah on Mount Carmel will, with regret, be rejected year after year? And this simply because, for the sake of variation, the two very fine Lessons are put down as alternatives for the same Sunday Evensong. But, I must ask, is variety after all so very needful or desirable? Surely if the very best Lessons are chosen—and, I submit, only the best should be read at the Sunday services—once a year is not too often for any congregation to hear these choice passages of God's Word.

C. Some Suggestions.

1. *Co-ordination.*—Something has been already said about co-ordinating the various Scriptures, so that if one Lesson is necessarily long, the other Lesson and the Psalms may be proportionately short. Further, would it not be a gain to have a single prominent thought attached to each Sunday—at least, those from Advent to Trinity? An advance in this direction has been made in the new Lectionary, but I think more might be done. For example, Faith, Hope, and Charity are almost suggested in the old lections as the teaching to be emphasized on the three Sundays respectively before Lent. In the same way the Advent Collects give the keynote for the teaching of the four Sundays of that season.

2. *Deletion of all alternatives*, which, as we have seen, serve no good purpose, but rather tend towards withdrawing from the people some of the best Scriptures.

3. *Separation of the morning from the evening series.*

4. *Sunday Courses for Two Years.*—Let the morning course of one year become the evening course of the next year, and *vice versa*. What would be the advantage of this arrangement? (*a*) Some *real* variety would be provided, if variety is needed. (*b*) All the best Lessons would be heard both in the morning and in the evening once in two years, and none but the best would be read at any time. For the Old Testament I believe this method would work admirably. Whether it would be equally good for the New Testament is not so certain; and I do not see why of necessity the same method need be applied to both Testaments now any more than in the old Lectionary which, as we know, had, on ordinary Sundays, Proper First Lessons but Second Lessons determined by the day of the month. I should regret it if a return to this method were proved to be inevitable—except for the greater Sundays. But whatever plan is followed, I am persuaded that none can be worse than the loading of the Kalendar with a great mass of alternative Lessons.

F. Douglas Robinson.

CHURCH AND STATE IN ITALY

I

The fact that relations of a more or less formal kind have been continued between representatives of the Church of England on the one side, and on the other the Primate of Belgium and certain distinguished priests of Belgium or France, is a matter of such far-reaching and varied promise that it involves subjects wider than the discussion of those technicalities and those differences which have been handled with such ability, such courtesy, and such sympathy by those taking part—as representatives, not as official delegates—in the conversations at Malines. The conversations, being approved on the one side by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the immense majority of the members of the Church of England, are recognized, on the other hand, by the Vatican. "*Il nous suffisait*," wrote Cardinal Mercier in a passage which was omitted by a certain Roman Catholic journal which reproduced the rest of his pastoral, "*de savoir que nous marchions d'accord avec l'autorité suprême, bénis et encouragés par elle.*" What is blessed and encouraged by the Pope is sure of sympathy, not to say enthusiasm, from most of his fold, and the comments of the Catholic organs in both France and Italy show that the Catholics of those countries look on the conversations as full of hope for more steps towards that final unity of Christendom which is the prayer and the promise of Our Lord. They arouse in England an interest in those practical questions which underlie theological differences—in the religious life of Roman Catholic countries and especially in the relations of the Vatican with the state in which it finds itself placed. It is, furthermore, to Rome and to St. Gregory the Great that Canterbury owes St. Augustine, and that old link between Italy and England has been constantly renewed. Even when England's established Church broke with the See of St. Peter, the influence of Rome remained in the vast majority of her formularies and her philosophies, and Italy fascinated her poets and thinkers from Shakespeare and Milton to Shelley and Keats, and from these to Tennyson, Browning, and George Eliot. At the present time several hundred thousand English people visit Italy every year. A temperamental, a national delight in Italy accompanies our interest in the relation of Anglicanism to the vast organization of Christianity which is both Italy's national Church and that

of thirty or forty other countries, and with representatives of which representatives of the Church of England have been conversing.

II

It is now just fifty-five years since Italy became a united whole, and she did so by capturing what had been known for well over a thousand years as the States of the Church. A compact organization of orthodox and international Christianity had grown up on the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, and as a centre comparatively free from the strife of princes, it had had over a small area its own independent government. No historian now denies that such an organization was best suited to assert the influence of Christianity among warring states and ambitious emperors: and the Government of Italy certainly risked a great principle when she despoiled the Papacy of almost all its temporal possessions. To establish a national capital in the one centre of international Christianity, to turn religious houses into government offices, to appropriate the private palace of the Pope as an office for the invading king, were not easy to defend unless moral principles were secondary to expediency. They provoked a just protest from the suffering Church.

But the situation was full of anomalies and compromises which put the protest into the background. The marauding Government passed a Law of Guarantees promising the Pope sovereign honours and full protection guaranteeing his free diplomatic intercourse with other countries, and offering him an annual indemnity of about £130,000: the Papal Church remained established by the Government, and the State arranged both to pay the priests and to maintain the churches: the Pope, though he refused the indemnity and all other acknowledgment of the guarantees, found both his income maintained and his prestige finally increased by the sympathy of other countries, and the loss of territory freed the Vatican organization for larger tasks. Papal diplomacy turned in a new and more fruitful direction: it asserted its international prestige by proving to peoples the necessity of its function. While Italy found that the Church provided her with much of her glory, and not a little of her income, the Church found that the invader's move had indirectly improved her own position. At the same time, she could not sacrifice her inalienable principle—the principle not that she wanted to govern territories, but that, as the representative of Divine authority among all nations and above all nations, she must not be in any sort of subjection to any one of them. She must have an absolute independence, so manifest

that no one could even accuse her of acting under the pressure of a coercing Government.

The war was the crux. It was clearly seen that Italy was doing nothing to impugn the neutrality of the Vatican, and that the Vatican was perfectly free to play her rôle. Cardinal Gasparri, the Secretary of State, made it clear, on the other hand, that he would accept no settlement of the Roman Question from victorious foreigners, but only by the goodwill of the Italian people. The subject has been treated in a thorough and illuminating way by Signor Vercesi in a book just published, *L'Italia, la Guerra e il Papato.* The war, as he shows, immensely strengthened the Vatican: it rid her of her three greatest obstacles—the Czar, the Kaiser, and the Khalif :* it freed her from the influence of Austria : it forced countries like Great Britain, Greece, and Holland to maintain diplomatic relations with her : and it showed the whole world that Christianity, organized as an international unity, could properly function as an instrument of health and peace in the complex organism of the modern world.

In all this, the Italians saw at once how closely the prestige and influence of the immemorial institution at Rome are associated with their racial genius and their national honour, and they began to take the place of France as the Vatican's defender; they made it clear how much they would welcome the emissary of the Pope at the Conference of Genoa in 1922, as they have since undertaken to represent his point of view at Geneva. The Fascisti Government has done all it can to support the projects of the Vatican : it set up the crucifix in the schools and arranged for religious education : it recognized titles conferred by the Pope and gave the new Catholic University at Milan the status of the National Universities at Naples or Pisa. It supported the Vatican arrangements for the Holy Year, giving excursion tickets to Rome, to which it has added free railway journeys to the Holy House at Loreto, to the Madonna at Pompei, and to the Shrine of St. Francis of Assisi. Furthermore, it encouraged the revival of the Corpus Christi processions in the streets, and advised the provincial governors, generals and mayors to take a place in the processions.

This great national acknowledgment does not necessarily mean active faith. Mussolini, at whose behest all this is done, is not often seen at Mass, and never at Confession or Communion. But he was seen to kneel for a considerable time before a statue of the Virgin when paying an official visit to a

* This statement is made on the highest authority — that of the Cardinal Secretary of State. Though the Vatican was outwardly in accord with these Powers, the formalities of courtesy were gained, but little freedom of action.

town in Northern Italy last autumn. He did this, he said in a speech immediately afterwards, because he wished to set an example of reverence and respect towards the immemorial traditions and habits of the Italian people, and to associate them with the great institution which had always brought them prestige.

Such an attitude of mind, which is very much that of old Rome, is by no means unknown in contemporary England. For members of the Church of England, whose faith and devotion are ill-defined, "the Church" still exists as an institution which represents both the solidarity of national society and the value of national ideals; and there are many who would no more think of disrespect towards it than they would of ordering their lives exactly according to the precepts of the Gospel. Whenever their own interests are at stake, they make their compromise as dignified as possible; Mussolini might have moulded his religious mentality in an English public school.

III

Like Mussolini's attitude in this is the attitude both Church and State have taken in Italy with regard to the Roman Question. The contentions of the Italian Government were admirably stated by Senator Antonio Fradeletto in the *Nineteenth Century* of June, 1923, and the present writer explained the point of view of the Church in the *Contemporary Review* of the preceding April. The Italian Government had always acted with moderation and can envisage no scheme to improve on the present position. In this sense, M. Eugene Guichard, writing in the *Mercure de France* of December, 1923, regarded the matter as settled, and said that if one wanted to know what had happened about it, one could only apply the lines of Corneille :

"Le combat cessa faute de combatants."

There is some truth in this, but not all the truth. For the Church, though she cares nothing about regaining her rightful territories, always insists upon her principles, and can in no way cease to demand the formal recognition of the political independence of the Vatican, as the one centre of international Christianity. The present position is that Italy recognizes the Pope as a person of sovereign dignity, but recognizes nothing as his territory and no one as his subjects. A sovereign without sovereignty is, says the Vatican, an absurdity; yet all must admit that it is an absurdity which somehow does not inconvenience over thirty different governments in maintaining official relations with the Papal Court.

The Papacy, however, can never be satisfied with a vague accommodation, no matter how convenient, and though it can afford to wait, it will continue to look for something more : that is to say, for either an international guarantee or for an increase of territorial independence to the Vatican—possibly a little of the land behind St. Peter's, stretching towards the pinewood of the Marquis Sacchetti—and this increased territorial independence would be accompanied by a formal diplomatic relation.

The difficulty about an international guarantee is that it involves other nations in maintaining the independence of a territory touching on Italy's own capital : and the difficulty about admitting territorial independence, as it is admitted in the case of the little Republic of San Marino in the Apennines, is that once more an outside power would be established almost in the capital. Meanwhile, the Pope refers to Italy as *nostra amata patria*, and invites Italy to send a representative to the Papal Court.

The accommodation therefore is complete, but it is an accommodation. If Mussolini can effect a final settlement the only disagreement will be removed in a relation which, though informal, is extremely close. The whole subject is thoroughly discussed by Jean Carrère, in his admirable book *Le Pape*, which has been translated into something which might be called English, by a very generous use of the word.

The steps taken towards a settlement of the Roman Question remind us that the Fascisti Government have gone far towards adopting the attitude which Gioberti pleaded before the Risorgimento in his famous book *Il Primato*. He argued that Italy's place in the modern world is to be that of a leader in Christian civilization, and that her greatness was to be in the closest relationship to the universal influence of her Church. Mussolini has spoken in much the same sense, identifying the power of Italy not with imperial ambition, but with the moral power of the great Christian organism which connects her life with that of other nations. A secret society of any kind, and, in particular, a secret society which is international, like that of the Freemasons, is therefore certain of all possible opposition from him. But he is able to reconcile the fiery nationalism of his movement with that serene influence which binds together hundreds of millions out of every nation in loyalty towards the venerable city which Italy now shares as a capital with the Church. With this it is suggestive to compare an utterance made by the present Pope in 1921, when he was enthroned at Milan as Archbishop. "The Papacy," he said, "is Italy's greatest glory."

The accommodation of the powers of the Church with those of the State of Italy involves one more principle of a more general interest and application. It is this: that a State depends for its stability not only on its own laws, but on a moral law, and that moral laws are inexplicably associated with the idea of a Law-giver, and so imply religion. The State therefore is logically compelled to admit the existence of a Church, and, if it has a Church, is logical both in establishing a connection between that Church and itself, and pledging itself to the support of the Church. So much the Italian Government has done, like those of most other Catholic countries. But when a State establishes a Church, it admits an authority that is, if it is anything at all, higher than that of the State. No Church worthy of its name can admit the laws of any State to have moral validity except as application of the Church's religious principles. It is at this point that democracies, and indeed all forms of government, are bound to realize that they are not absolute. A Church which does not at times protest against the State is hardly likely to be performing its duty to that State. It should in the nature of things be able to see farther and wider than the self-interest which expresses itself in the transient patriotism of any State. The Vatican, in asking for recognized independence, implicitly asserts that a Divine authority which is above all nations and works among them for the good of them all is of more importance than the interests of Italy, and is, furthermore, the best and most enduring safeguard of Italy herself.

IV

It was remarked by Macaulay nearly a hundred years ago that since the Reformation Protestant countries have become Catholic, but no Catholic countries have become Protestant. Protestantism has lost the power it had at a crisis in history against the ancient traditional forms of unified Christianity. In Italy Protestantism interests a minimum of the people: in fact, they are under one per cent., and so are the Jews. The people therefore are Roman Catholics, or they are nothing. In view of the Conversation at Malines, it is of immediate interest to consider just what that means.

Statistics are not available, but after years in Italy certain facts become indisputable. The first is the responsibility of the clergy: it is just as true all over Italy as it is in Ulster or Holstein or Holland that the people follow good clergy and respond to their influence, and become indifferent if a minister of religion is indifferent. Moving from one village to another

in the Apennines, one finds one parish church full and the next empty. In the full church, the priest is loved; in the empty church, the priest is despised. The Sacraments there administered are prized as such by the people in Papist Italy very much as Anglican Sacraments are prized by the people in Anglican England: everyone, that is to say, insists on infant baptism; devout women come often to Holy Communion. Men sometimes tend to be indifferent about regular attendance at Mass, and at the great festivals the Churches are full of people who have not, as a whole, a genius for organized worship. None would forego the Church's blessing at a wedding.

The only difference is that hardly a single Italian would willingly die without the Last Sacraments. And that difference implies something more, as we see in the continual stream of devotees in church after church, and in the fact that among them are often more men than women. It means that Catholic Christianity, as Mussolini suggested, is so closely associated with the whole life of Italy that the Church is a part of the people without their effort, and that, to adapt the expression of Wordsworth, God is with them when they know it not. An un-selfconscious Christianity, a simple humble faith, is the blessing that Italy owes to being free from the noisy rivalry of sects. All prayer is an elevation of the mind to the life of heaven, and the Italians elevate their minds by an image or a card or a picture in their rooms, and, as Bavarians put a crucifix at the cross-roads, by putting a memorial of the Mother and Child in the retired cottage and the busy street. There, as Stevenson said of a Spanish crucifix, it silently preaches to passers-by of noble truths. That is deeply true of the life of Italy: seven-eights of her population are peasants, and hardly ever will one enter a peasant's cottage without a Madonna. In a crude mill in the primitive village of Mignano, near Naples, a decrepit man beside the mill stones pointed the writer to a little card depicting the Virgin Mother: "There it is beside me all day," said the old poor man, "keeping the place holy and good." And one felt the mill was, as soldiers said of the hospitals of Florence Nightingale, "as 'oly as a Church." And so often in a busy street of Rome or Florence, or across the Lagoon at Venice, one has looked up to see flowers set in wire on the wall, and a lamp lit, often before the dusk, and felt one's heart thrill at the devotion there. Through the centuries never has Italy wavered in the devotion of the masses of either her men or her women to the blessed Mother, and perhaps that is why the Italian population is to-day increasing more rapidly than any other in Europe. Children are regarded as the *raison d'être* of marriage, and its peculiar blessing.

They swarm the villages, and crowd the streets, and unemployment is unknown.

How often ill-informed English people speak of Italy as a country of robbers and beggars, of a treacherous and idle people! Scoundrels indeed there are, and many of the people have their faults, but laziness and dishonesty are not among them. Cheerfulness, patience, industry—these are the peculiarity of Italy, and give her her greatness. And if it is still true that Italy, which looks so much like a garden of Paradise, is a country of artists and of saints, it is so because her people are courteous, patient, and hardworking.

But passionate worship is no more general than immorality: and, as in England, respectability is generally accepted as a substitute for religious devotion. Human nature is very much the same, even where the sun is clearer and wits are quicker. The problem of the priest hardly alters: it begins and ends almost always in his own soul.

V

Is there a difference between the peasant masses of thirty-five millions, and that sprinkling of more educated people who live among the five millions of the towns? The vigour, the industry, and the health are far less general. In the towns, too, for the most part, are the intellectual classes who support the purveyors of immoral publications, like Gabriel d'Annunzio or Gracia Deledda.

But it must not be supposed that these are the only tastes of the people. The names of Papini and Delcroix are reminder enough how much culture and thought are profoundly Christian: and the culture is very general. Italy, for the most part, takes an interest in her masterpieces both of art and literature, as well as in contemporary achievement. Clubs and societies of all the Government employees, for example, succeed in obtaining, at a cost of about two shillings a month, classic music or foreign lecturers as distinguished as Tagore. There are universities at Turin, Milan, Padua, Bologna, Pisa, Florence, Rome, Naples, and Bari.

The thought of Italy's intellectuals has been for long devoted especially to practical problems, and one of the peculiarities of the whole people is their interest in engineering, and especially in electricity. They have produced Galvani, Volta, and Marconi. But among living philosophers they take a lead to-day with Croce, Gentile, and Ruggieri. All of these are to some extent Hegelians, but they are Hegelians of a much more Christian mould than German Hegelians have generally been.

They are, in fact, very much under the influence of their own nineteenth-century philosophers: Gioberti and Rosmini, Tommaseo, Conti, and Bonghi. All of these tend to correct Hegelianism by comparison with the Aristotelian Platonism which centuries of massive thought found so congenial to the Christian Scheme. It might be said therefore that Italian idealism is very much modified by the revival of scholastic philosophy due to Leo XIII.'s Bull, *Æterni Patris*. It is interesting to recall that the Scholastic Revival was pioneered in the north of Europe by Cardinal Mercier, and so has a connection with the name of Malines. But in Italy the fact is that the influence of Dante is so strong that his brilliant statement of Thomistic thought, sometimes philosophy, more often theology, modifies the whole mind of Italy from youth to age. When the supreme poet of a civilization has moulded a language by one masterpiece, read with the greatest care in every secondary school, and though so popular, yet worthy of the profound study of the most acute scholars and thinkers, it is natural enough that his philosophy, when it receives the enthusiastic approval of the Church, will modify all philosophies that are related to it, as all, since the time of Dante, surely are. Medieval logic, says Mr. Collingwood in *Speculum Mentis*, "is still the background of all our speech and thought." The pronouncement comes as a challenge to the contemporary Englishman from a neo-Hegelian: in Italy it would be only a platitude.

Twenty years ago the modernism of certain Catholics provoked the famous Papal pronouncements *Pascendi Gregis* and *Lamentabili sine*, and though these were directed chiefly against an English Jesuit and a Parisian Professor, there were, at the same time, a certain number of Italians who conceived it their duty to defend the philosophy and theology of the Roman Catholic Church by explaining it away. To what extent do they survive? The recent suspension of a priest like Don Ernesto Buonaiuti, by the Holy Office, follows on the Vatican's tactful abandonment of the leaders of the Popular Party, the founder of which, Don Romolo Murri, now lives, married, as a layman. But the following of such priests as Buonaiuti or Murri, being mostly students in Universities, is not typical of the country. It is true that they often ask the questions common enough in England: How can one say that God Almighty became a baby? Or how can you say that a priest has the power to forgive sins? But crude incredulity of this kind, however general, does not require new philosophies to meet it. It arises not from the restlessness of new thought, but from the inertia of old unenlightenment.

Of a different nature is the movement which supports the Theosophical review *Bylichnis*.* Theosophy is not a strong movement in Italy, but that it has able men within it is clear from *Bylichnis* and the interest it takes in movements of thought other than its own. It reaches out a hand to modernism in Italy, and searches for religious philosophies outside the traditional boundaries of Christianity, or those of its traditional Aristotelian Platonism. That even a movement of this kind is still much influenced by Christianity is clear from the amount of attention it gives to *Theology*.

What, then, are the ideas with which better knowledge of the relation by the nation of Italy to its Church, and to its Church's central organization, enrich our interest in the courteous discussions which have been taking place in Belgium? What English hopes for the reunion of Christendom are fostered by those relations? We see first that there is still an extraordinary similarity between the problem of religion in relation to human nature, that human nature is very much the same, and that the ways of influencing it are very much the same as they have been in England, both since the Reformation and before. The changes made then were not negligible, least of all since they made a tragic break in the unity of Christendom. But the changes made did nothing of what they claimed of applying redemption more directly to the human soul: the human frailties of the clergy, the human frailties of the laity remain very much the same. For the disruption of international society we are not compensated by splendid differences. Un-selfconscious virtues were made less easy to attain: and nothing could be more absurd than to think that the Italian laity find that their respect for the Papacy and its Church fetters their freedom of activity, either in thought or in action. The delight in liberty, the glory in the work of ordering and ordered reason distinguish both Italy and her Church as the inheritor of Latin civilization. Italy offers no example of practical impossibilities, which would remain as barriers if doctrinal difficulties could be settled. Inward illumination, humility, charity, mutual understanding—these are the means by which the Holy Spirit is leading us into the unity of eternal truth, the exchange, in fact, of vague platitudes for sensitive and searching knowledge.

R. E. Gordon George.

* We are unable to agree with Mr. George when he speaks of *Bylichnis* as theosophical. We should regard it as an Italian parallel to our *Hibbert Journal*, and exceedingly well done.—Ed.

BARON VON HÜGEL

I HAVE been invited to write this article as one of the original members of the London Society for the Study of Religion in which Baron Von Hügel was the leading personality. Starting therefore from L.S.S.R. as a text, I shall briefly refer to the theological atmosphere in London twenty years ago and to the Baron's appearance as a new star in our firmament; passing thence to some personal reminiscences.

The L.S.S.R., founded in 1904, was a sign of the times and of the widespread and rather anxious interest in the adjustment of new ways and old in theological thought. The controversy of "Religion and Science" was no longer so keen, but the case for a critical study even of the Old Testament had been only very lately established, and outside the Universities there were few who were prepared for the application of historical methods to the study of the New Testament and to all the traditions and documents of the Faith. Driver had indeed (in the preface to his Introduction, sixth edition, 1897) noted the rapid "advance of critical opinion" during the nineties, mentioning Gore, Loisy, Von Hügel, Kirkpatrick, Sanday, Ottley, and the Bishops at the Lambeth Conference (July, 1897) as leaders of the advance. But I found on joining the Staff of King's College, London, in the same year that the Old Testament teaching was in the hands of two dear old gentlemen who still lectured from the pre-critical platform, and that parochial feeling as represented by the students was no more favourable than were the two lecturers to the "advance of critical opinion." The cause was very far from being won, and indeed many clergy who ran somewhat ahead of their brethren and their congregations were put to a good deal of suffering for their opinions. However, just as we in King's College were soon to learn much from A. Robertson, Nairne, Headlam, Watson, and others, so also in the Church at large the first ten years of the century were years of new leadership and fresh light.

They were years of many new societies in London. People gathered round the Baron in L.S.S.R., round Dr. Inge in the Religious Thought Society, and in groups such as the Quiet XII. A facetious brother recommended me to found yet another Society—to be called the Quiet One!

Tyrrell said the true Anglican was neither the dogmatic Protestant nor the dogmatic sacerdotalist, but the illogical vague middleman, whose claim was to be seeking rather than to have attained a synthesis of liberty and authority. But if I recall

with any truth the Anglican temper of the first few years of the century, many who were looking for the synthesis had little active hope of approaching it until they received the help of Von Hügel and Tyrrell. Some at least of us knew at our first meeting with Von Hügel that we had taken a new turning. How angry one was after the first hearing of the Baron (1903?) when a learned member of our "Broad and Narrow" School exclaimed, "I know too much of this German mysticism!" Here indeed, one felt, was a great teacher able to be loyal not only to the values of intellectual truth, but also to the values of tradition and of religious experience—just the teacher to help us in the typically Anglican task of seeking for a reconciliation between the Catholic idea and the Critical idea. Here was a deeper appreciation of both ideas at once and (most instructively) a deeper sense of the strain of holding them together than we had ever met, and, above all perhaps, a deeper trust that God meant them to be held together, and meant us to accept the strain with patience and hope as part of our earthly probation. It is much to be desired that someone would pay a tribute to the memory of Von Hügel by tracing out and exhibiting his remarkable influence on English Catholicism, and especially his stimulating influence on our younger Churchmen at Oxford and Cambridge.

In L.S.S.R., founded in 1904, the Baron touched a society much wider than the English Church—a society indeed in which all the chief religious bodies in the country were represented by such men as J. H. Wicksteed, C. G. Montefiore, Lilley, I. Abrahams, Corrance, Edmund Gardner, Comper, Burkitt, Lacey, Workman, Bennett, Skinner, and A. Caldecott, through whose kindness I was made a member. The Baron was acknowledged to be the life and soul of the Society. His learning and zeal, his humour and tact, kept us all in harmony and all alive with interest for ten good years. Then came the war, scattering many friends. But the Baron was a member till his death, and had for twenty years helped his fellow-members in no small measure towards the adjustment of things old and new, though he taught and they knew that the perfect adjustment was for ever a flying goal. The Baron was a great correspondent. Many of those who were honoured by his friendship will doubtless be reviving (as I now revive), from pre-war deposits of his letters, happy memories of those earlier days and of the Master's gentle and affectionate condescension upon their welfare, their thoughts and works, and even their personal and family affairs. I shall venture to use in this paper some letters which help me and may help others to bring back to mind the flavour of those days. A picture-postcard (Septem-

ber, 1907) of a mountain resort in Italy refers to a trip abroad: "Have had a grand time, spending three full days with Fogazarro, a full day with H. J. Holtzmann and seeing eight other men of a similar type." The Baron regarded Holtzmann's great Introduction to the New Testament as a mine of wisdom, and induced us to explore those gigantic tunnellings in which I, for one, found myself fairly mazed. He seemed to know personally, as well as through their books, most of the chief thinkers, theological and philosophical, in Germany, France and Italy, and he had a unique power of making us realize the existence and quality of the great world of thought. On finding this picture-postcard I read again Fogazarro's *The Saint*, and recalled the days when the expectation of "Papa Angelico" did not seem a will-o'-the-wisp. How touching the breath of hope and joy which rises from this card! How fascinating the romance of the Italian party of freedom! Groups, meeting as in Mazzinian days for privacy's sake on mountain-tops; tracked sometimes and "exposed"—with names and *addresses!*—in "black" journals; but filled with a real hope for new freedom of thought within the great Church. And in England there had been Tyrrell's essays—*e.g.*, *Beati Excommunicati*—privately circulated, with their unhesitating determination to be no less faithful to the Church than to God's modern revelations. If we are deprived of the Sacraments, we will hear Mass. If they drive us from the Church, we will stand at the door. If they drive us from the door, we will listen at the windows, but they can never make us be silent about truth. That was the burden of the message—a message which seemed to come with an air of strange appeal from the hidden soul of the Roman Catholic Church. It was exhilarating to share the hopes of this scattered company of scholars and to learn the lesson new to many, but never since forgotten in the English Church, that a man might righteously pretend to be at once a loyal Catholic and a loyal servant of all Truth. No one pretended to resolve the antinomy of Tradition and Freedom, but many noble souls have found that their highest honesty was to let neither member of the antinomy be sacrificed to the other.

But alas! in the same September of 1907 the Encyclical *Pascendi* fell like a thunderbolt. On September 30 and October 1 George Tyrrell wrote in two letters to *The Times* his famous answer to the Pope, the tone of which "made the Baron sad," as Tyrrell wrote to Lilley on October 3. On October 22 Tyrrell was informed that he was deprived of the sacraments. In the eyes of the Pope there was no antinomy to be resolved. There was only one principle to be considered—Authority; and the seat of Authority was in the will of the Pope.

Yet, in spite of this violent apocalypse, the Baron never gave up hope of combining a reasonable authority and a reasonable liberty. Only, the refrain of "anxiety" becomes more frequent in his letters. But he never failed to acknowledge and to teach how good the work of a merely authoritative religion could be, and how sure and rich the experience that could grow beneath its shelter. "A friend of mine, a clever young man," he would say, "was studying in those medical circles at Berlin which generate the most acute and ruthless of all criticisms of religion. He came to me for advice. 'You must go,' I prescribed, 'to live for some months among the Catholic peasantry of Würtemberg.' He went. He experienced their life of faith and love and patient heroism, and he confessed that here also was life and truth with a health and a depth not to be found in Berlin." Thus the Baron and his justice, quoted roughly from my memory after nearly twenty years; much in the vein in which Illingworth would say to us in Oxford days: "Go work in a parish and learn about life and death, love and hate, joy and sorrow." It was through the L.S.S.R., as aforesaid, that I came into touch with Von Hügel and received letters from him every now and then until about half-way through the war, when, owing to a change of work, I lost touch with things and people in London. These letters show that it was in 1904 that I was admitted to the increasing number of those younger Anglicans who were invited from time to time to an afternoon "stroll and talk" in Kensington Gardens. For example, one of our most gifted young theologians, Leslie Johnston, whose death in Flanders brought heavy loss to English theology, profited greatly by such talks. There was no greater spiritual or intellectual enjoyment. The Baron seemed to hold nothing back. He poured forth rich experiences of men and books. He was about the most unproselytizing person you could meet. Again and again one knew of great help, intellectual and spiritual, given to Anglican men and women. But there was never the slightest suspicion that he would even so much as prefer them to be Roman Catholics, nor did he at all care for any school or party in the English Church which seemed to hanker after Roman Catholic ways. I think that he treated with respect the essential Catholic claim of the English Church. His mind was always upon the great things of Catholicism, and he was more amused than anything else with the smaller side. He had much to give and of great quality, and he used to pour it out in conversation as if he found life too short to give all that he wanted to give. Sometimes in Kensington Gardens, carried away in declamation, he would gesticulate with his umbrella, making one tremble for the safety

of nurses and children, who regarded us with wide-eyed astonishment.

In January, 1908, came an invitation to "promenade" in the Park "flanked" by Von Hügel and Tyrrell. The friendship of these two may be followed in Miss Petre's pages from the first invitation to Tyrrell for "lunch and a walk and a talk" (1897) to the last scene when Tyrrell was laid to rest in 1909. By 1902 Tyrrell would write: "Surely I have grown from a boy to a man since I have known you." The Baron was a marvellous tutor. He knew by instinct the books to recommend. In those five years he had led Tyrrell deep into the best of modern philosophy and Biblical criticism. But he was more than a great tutor. He was a father of minds and souls. His personality seemed to envelop the disciple with a gentle power both of encouragement and restraint. He was so ripe in learning and so deep in experience and discipline that he was always far ahead, albeit so humanly alongside. No decent or intelligent person admitted to this discipleship could possibly look up to the Master with anything less than filial reverence and grateful affection; and with a readiness to be rebuked which few other masters could inspire. The brilliant and impatient Irishman had this readiness. The Baron had written to him that "quick-witted men ought to be ashamed of doing" something Tyrrell had done, and the disciple replies (*Life of George Tyrrell*, p. 296): "My dearest Friend, That was a grand letter in every sense and I thank you for it most heartily."

Tyrrell died July 15, 1909. Receiving soon after a command from Dr. Headlam to write an article on Tyrrell for the *Church Quarterly*, I wrote for the Baron's advice. He replied that Tyrrell had told him that he attached most importance to two articles: "Theology and Devotion" (*The Faith of the Millions*, vol. i.) and "From Heaven or of Men" (*Scylla and Charybdis*). "Tyrrell used to say that in the first of these he had found, on looking back, the root and substance of all he had striven and suffered for; and the two papers taken together seem to me to give us, in the finest form attained by him, the nucleus of his teachings, a nucleus that will abide; and to these two papers I would myself add, 'The Prospects of Re-union' (*The Faith of the Millions*, vol. ii.), as containing the very soul of what, later on, he developed sometimes with vehemence and indeed some bitterness. I love these three papers through and through." The Baron then made suggestions for my article as follows: (1) The troubles of Tyrrell, as of all "modernists," came from two sources, not from one. "By all means point out, underline as much as you like, the morally offensive, the insincere and cruel methods and temper of mind of Ultramontanism, the way

in which it has to maintain one sort of excesses by excesses of another sort. You will be doing good all round by such an attitude, provided always you have the loyalty to point out equally clearly that 'Modernism' is in no sense an exclusively Roman Catholic trouble, that the problems which haunted Tyrrell and helped to break his life are besetting every form of traditional institutional Christianity; and that not all the 'moderation,' 'English spirit,' 'gentlemanly bearing,' 'fine Oxford tone and manner,' and all the rest put together, not the *via media*, or any other attitude or device of this kind, however acceptable and useful in its own place and degree, reach and solve these fundamental problems thoroughly common to Canon Sanday and Pope X., Bishop Gore and Cardinal Merry del Val. As our friend Lilley has said so well, the contrasting divisions are no more vertical, denominational—they are horizontal, inter-denominational"; (2) the Baron points out that, though during the last six months or so of 1907 Tyrrell was very strongly drawn back towards Anglicanism, yet this almost irresistible fascination left him by the end of the year, and the last six months of his life saw him fully re-established in his resolution to stay within the Roman Catholic Church; (3) as regards Tyrrell's character all round and as a man, the Baron says he feels a difficulty in writing about him: "For if to be a saint is to be generous and heroic, to spend yourself for conscience and for souls, then Tyrrell is a saint; but if to be a saint is to be faultless, to be free from resentment, bitterness and excessive reactions against excesses of your opponents, then Tyrrell is a considerable sinner." And here follow remarks about Tyrrell's relations with Bishop Matthew, how the two highly irascible, vindictive Celts for some time egged each other on in firebrand courses.

The Baron's generous gifts were offered not only to individuals, but also to societies, as may be seen from *Essays and Addresses*. Before saying a word about his sense of responsibility in addressing various groups of young and old, I should like to point out that this volume contains a good deal of self-revelation. For example (p. 286), he refers to his great debt to the Dutch friar who first trained him in the spiritual life in Vienna "fifty years ago," and to the French secular priest, to whom "I owe more than to any man I have ever known in the flesh." Again, in the letter to a mother who had lost her little child (p. 98), he sets out the "dispositions I have had to gain and practise for myself now during forty years—for example: (1) To be athirst for wisdom, not cleverness; to be humble and simple or (at least) to feel a wholesome shame at not being so—to be just *straight* and anxious for some light and ready to pay

for it and practise it." Italicize also the words that follow "*straight*"; weigh them well and there you have the Baron himself; (2) to cultivate the habit of dropping all insistence upon great and continuous clearness. This was his constant teaching. All his books speak of our knowledge of God as being at best real, rich and vivid, but never perfectly clear. "Dim, but definite," is one of his phrases. So, he says, our dogs know and love us, vividly, not clearly. Often they leave us, for they require the company of their fellows, the company that affords so much poorer, but so much clearer, impressions. But also they really require the company of their master, man —what they can but reach out to, more or less. "The Super-human, the Real, *cannot* be as clear to me even as I am to my dog." But, he proceeds, if this be so, what protection have we against mere fancy and superstition? He replies by a sketch of Darwin, always loving, learning, watching facts, but always with the sense that he was learning reality, with a discovery not clear but vivid, not simple but rich—a discovery which won credit because of the convergence of so many facts upon it and because of the illumination thus shed on so many other facts. We get to know realities as we become worthy to know them, less self-occupied, more outward moving, more gladly lost in the crowd, more rich in giving all we have and especially all we are. And thus we know that we really know those realities by finding our knowledge fruitful.

Fruitful certainly were his own gifts not only, as I said, to individuals, but also to a wide variety of groups, Anglican and others. And the gifts were costly to him, not easily given. Let me quote one characteristic example of his scrupulous sense of responsibility, from a letter dated December 7, 1912. "Before I turn finally to other things I want to apologize and as far as is possible now to make amends for what I saw very clearly on my way home last night to have been the abrupt termination of my little address to your finely keen young men. I had announced to them that only the end would really explain the beginning of my address and *vice versa*, and then when I got near the end—*the end never came!* It was, I think, not only the effect of my recent weakness and ill-health; it was even more the sense which grew as I proceeded in my talk of what a burden of complication I was laying upon young shoulders. What the logic of my position and my experience of these things involves is, however, as follows: Not only is the Church, *a* Church, necessary (at least in the long run, upon the whole, indirectly) for a full, firm, delicate, elastic, wholesome faith in God and in Christ; but some such faith in God and in Christ is necessary to the end for such a faith in the Church. So

little is it true that I ought to be simply passive in the hands of Churchmen that my adhesion to the Church becomes fully fruitful and entirely wholesome only *if that very faith which the Church so largely helps to foster in me reacts strongly back upon and continuously checks, purifies, steadies and sobers this my Church allegiance.*" After developing his idea further and asking me to explain it to the students, the Baron says: "I had fixed my eyes while speaking upon a winning, apple-cheeked, keen young countenance" (alas! he was then quite a stupid young man). "I so love youth, and then I discover with pain that I have put too much upon them." Truth to say, it was much too stiff for them, but they were all much the better for hearing him. Other letters testify to the strain of such work, of his care in preparation, and of his "gratitude" to the audience "for giving me a hearing." Again in 1909: "I do not know whether you still care for your idea that I should speak to a group of men and women you are trying to help. I am tired now, and only if the thing were quite straight from the heart could I manage it on my little present strength. I understood from you that these are not fully settled, cheerily comfortable Church people. You will understand how much I should wish to be sure as to the kind of people I was addressing, since nothing is more distressing, I find, than unwittingly to unsettle settled souls instead of helping the other way on. You will also readily guess that I do not refer to any confessional differences, but to the critical problems which, unbeknown to many, beset us all."

And then, after the address had been given, again a letter asking for them all to be told something he had forgotten to say, and a list of devotional books for "the tall lady whose countenance impressed and encouraged me somehow in my poor attempt at articulating deep and indeed the deepest things." Perhaps I may mention that the Baron's physiognomy was much nearer the mark this time than in the case of the apple-cheeked student! In the years of these recollections, along with the finishing and publication of his great book on the *Mystical Element* (a book which gave a new turn to theological thought here and abroad) and his book on *Eternal Life* (a valuable summary of his doctrine over a wide field of subjects), and along with his incessant activity in giving help to individuals and groups, and his fresh studies and his correspondence, the Baron was more and more preoccupied with what he regarded as the great fight of combating subjectivism. I seem to remember a certain analogy between two movements in those years: (1) A school of scientific thought, which recoiled from the "dogmatism" of affirming any sort of "force" as

the explanation of physical phenomena. All that should be attempted was to observe and register changes on the surface of appearance and to work out the "law" of their recurrence; (2) a school of theological students (was not Loisy numbered among them after his excommunication and certainly by 1911?) who held, in much the same way, that theology was merely descriptive of ideas (*e.g.*, of Trinity, Incarnation, etc.), which happened somehow to bob up above the surface of the human mind in this or that age or country. The business of theology was to note and classify the events which occurred on the mental plane of "appearance," but was in no way concerned with their ultimate cause or "reality." In the course of human evolution various and very high ideas and ideals have appeared, but we must exercise a strict and indeed a fiercely negative economy in using such "explanations" as Inspiration, Revelation, Grace or even God. To the Baron's mind here was the big fight, the fundamental fight for religion. In a letter of September, 1911, he writes: "Your letter came to me at a moment of great depression, for Murri had just published an answer to my 'Religione ed illusione' (see *Essays and Addresses*, No. 2), which is indeed kind towards myself personally, but in which deliberately and with the utmost clearness he abandons all and every non-human ontological transcendence and plumps solidly for Feuerbach—at least, for Feuerbach of the stage combated by me in that article. Murri, till quite recently and largely until this pronouncement, was quite satisfactory, indeed, even scholastically correct in all these great matters, and it is sad to have been, though not, I think, at all the cause, yet the occasion, of such a pronouncement! And several other smaller things had been happening, all more or less in this (depend upon it now dominant) subjectivist direction." I have not attempted in these pages, nor indeed dare I attempt, to summarize the Baron's theology. Suffice it to say that in the three deep and rugged books above-mentioned, I believe there could be found all the elements of a Christian philosophy of Religion and Ethics which has no equal in value to-day. The Baron's posthumous book (not yet published), on which he spent the strength of his last years, may bring simplicity and order into this rich mass of elements; but otherwise what a fine and useful task for some young scholar to master and organize all this wonderful material in an "Interpretation of Von Hügel"!

In the passage extracted above, it appears that Murri had taken the same turning as Loisy after being excommunicated—a turning doubtless to be explained in part by inevitable reaction against the violence of Papal dogmatism. One had always

heard that Murri was in trouble with the Pope as the leader of an Italian Church movement of sympathy with social and democratic ideas—a "social" Modernism. Clearly the Baron was surprised as well as saddened by Murri's answer to his article. He records that his own book (*Essays and Addresses*) is penetrated by a conviction which he has for fifty years wistfully found to be somehow rare even among men who are sincerely religious—the conviction that Religion begins and proceeds and ends with the Given, with realities which environ and penetrate us and which we always have to apprehend anew; the conviction that a real, if dim, "confused" knowledge of reality is with us already prior to all our attempts clearly to analyze or completely to synthesize it. In the same letter the Baron, in referring to his *Mystical Element*, writes: "I trust you may like what I have been groping after in the last chapter—the purgatorial function of severe scientific methods and habits, within the complete life, with regard to religion. Tyrrell considered that I had thus got hold of a fact and principle which have a large future before them. May I or others succeed in making it clearer and more impressive!" The Baron had been through this discipline himself, not only by patiently learning critical methods in Biblical and philosophical study, but also by learning geology. In one letter he refers to Dr. Sibley, the Professor of Geology at King's College, to whom I had the pleasure of introducing him that he might spend some quiet hours in our laboratory as a measure of relief in a time of great anxiety. Readers of the *Life of Tyrrell* may remember how the Baron wrote to him two months before the death of the latter: "I was fifty-seven yesterday and am giving myself a set of newer geological books, a geological hammer, and a set of geological type specimens. So expect you to tramp about with me to gravel pits and quarries, please": and readers of the Baron's works will remember how his philosophy—a Critical Realism—enabled him to value all the lower grades of reality, not only animals, but also "things," and to understand the "thing-element" as a factor in the full life of religion.

A disregard for this "thing-element," especially in its bearing upon Church and Sacraments, was, according to the Baron, a weakness in Tröltsch, in whom he otherwise found and helped others to find a great source of light. But space forbids me to say more about Von Hügel's attitude towards the Church than just this; which is only said for the sake of those who did not know him: he believed with mind and heart in the Holy Catholic Church. In particular, he felt himself to belong, body and soul, to the Roman Catholic Church. The idea of offering to his Church anything less than perfect and lifelong

allegiance was, to his mind, no more thinkable than to offer anything less than this to mother or wife. Yet his love was far from being uncritical. Some astonishment has been expressed at his "mystical optimism" about the future of the Roman Church. Such astonishment is natural to those who did not understand him. He knew, as well as anyone knew, the unsatisfactory side of modern Rome. All this may be read in the long chapter in "Eternal Life," which is perhaps the best contemporary estimate of the Roman Church. In this chapter the Baron gives the grounds of his hope. But the ultimate ground lies deeper—in gratitude and in love which beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things.

Memories, thoughts from his books, passages from his letters, fly about in the minds of his friends like flocks of birds. The space I have been so kindly invited to fill is more than filled—and so hastily filled!—with those earlier days before the war. If some of the letters I have used may stir up others to use the letters they have from "The Baron" (as he was known to hundreds), then I shall be very glad. Perhaps I may end with recording an impression always to be cherished. This man had not only *thought* the great things of God. His whole nature, his habitual disposition of soul, had been steadily trained to accord with the greatness of his thoughts. Not only heroism (*e.g.*, in the conquest of pain and sorrow) made him a great soul, but also the virtues which he always coupled with heroism —humility and homeliness. He was at home in regions high above us, but he made us at home with him and helped us all at least a little higher. His friendship was a gift of God—a large, wise, gentle benediction as from a father in God.

G. E. Newsom.

THOUGHTS ON GEORGE FOX

The journals* of George Fox, Founder of the Society of "Friends," are an intensely human document, scarcely to be matched in our literature for its self-portrayal of a character that came more nearly than almost any man's to the great Christian ideal which we profess to follow.

Christ had said, "Be ye perfect," and Fox always held that once we had received Christ into our hearts to dwell in us, there could be no more sin. Asked if he had no sin, he answered: "Sin? Christ my Saviour hath taken away my sin,

* *The Journals of George Fox*, edited by Norman Penney, F.S.A. J. M. Dent and Sons, 1924. 5s.

and in Him there is no sin." And, indeed, whatever we may think of this creed, his life was a striking commentary on it.

Yet this wonderful man, made an Apostle, like Paul, by direct revelation, was treated by his fellow-countrymen with few exceptions—by magistrates, officials, judges, clergy, and common people—with almost incredible inhumanity. Though Cromwell and Charles II. both befriended him, he was brought sixty times before magistrates and courts, and imprisoned at Nottingham, Derby, Carlisle, Launceston, Lancaster, Scarborough, and Worcester for periods varying between six months and two and a half years. Some of the jails into which he was barbarously thrust, more especially that which was called Doomsdale at Launceston, were so shockingly filthy and horrible that they cannot be described here (see p. 128). He was put in the stocks, buffeted with staves *and even with Bibles*, knocked down and trampled upon. More than once he came near to being assassinated, and he was threatened with transportation and hanging. Though his health was prematurely broken down, his indomitable spirit triumphed over all that man could do.

Had he been allowed to preach his gospel in freedom and peace, it is impossible to say what good he might have done his country. Even with the terrible limitations under which he worked, how much he accomplished! The Society which he founded before his death numbered thousands, and extended beyond the United Kingdom to America, the West Indies, and the Continent. "Friends" were then and are now, distinguished to a remarkable degree by sobriety, honesty, and charity. The "Seed of God" which he planted has lived on for three hundred years, and there are some who think that a religion such as Fox preached may yet, in the increasing materialism of the world and amid the dissensions which distract the Christian Church, appeal to the spiritual instincts of mankind, and make all believers, irrespective of dogmas and institutions, into one People of God and His Christ.

George Fox was born in July, 1624, at Fenny Drayton, in the heart of England, on the borders of Leicestershire and Warwickshire, his father being a weaver known by his neighbours for his probity as "righteous Christer." From his earliest days George showed an earnest bent towards spiritual things. Before he was twelve he "felt that he knew pureness and righteousness, and to keep to his Yea and Nay." At God's command, as he says, he left home on October 9, 1643, to lead a life of loneliness and self-communing; and for many years he went about the countryside discussing spiritual things with members of all sects and Churches. The whole of England was at this time in a state of religious ferment and political

unrest, and this upheaval produced two of the most remarkable personalities in our history—Oliver Cromwell and George Fox.

These two great men were brought into contact several times. Fox on many occasions wrote to and interviewed Cromwell on behalf of the sufferings of Friends. And they naturally discussed religion and Truth. Cromwell evidently had a fellow-feeling all along for Fox, and shared his spiritual point of view. He caught him by the hand on the termination of his first interview and *with tears in his eyes* asked him to come again to his house. But Fox was not afraid to admonish the Protector, bidding him keep in the fear of God, that he might receive wisdom from Him, and urging him to lay down his crown at the feet of Christ, and this more than once (but how was such a course possible?). On this occasion he was standing by the table and Cromwell came and sat upon the side of the table, and said "he would be as high as I." Meeting him when there was a rumour of his being made King, he warned him that "they that would put him on a crown would take away his life, and bid him mind the crown that was immortal." Later he wrote and told Cromwell he had been warned by God of the King's return, and that while he was persecuting God's people his enemies were preparing to come upon him.

Two more vivid pictures he gives us of Cromwell. Just before the latter's fatal illness he met him riding at the head of his Life Guard. "I saw and felt (he says) a waft of death go forth against him, and when I came to him he looked like a dead man." As the Protector lay dead and they were sounding trumpets over his image, "my spirit," says Fox, "was greatly grieved, and the Lord I found was highly offended." When he saw Cromwell's body hanged at Tyburn he remembered that at Dunbar he had promised God, if given the victory, he would abolish tithes or "else (said he) let me be rolled in the grave with infamy." Yet since then he had confirmed the law against non-payers of tithes.

Fox described himself as a "preacher of righteousness," and the keynote of his career was the absolute certainty he felt that he was in direct contact with God, and that every soul that had the Inner Light of Christ was thereby made one with God and entered into the perfection of Christ. So no priest, rite, ceremony, sacrament, or dogma was needed to bring a man to Christ. Marriage by priests or baptism he did not consider ordained or necessary, nor was the Eucharist required by those who had accepted Christ in their hearts, "for He had come in to sup with them and they with Him." "I came (he says) to know God experimentally, and was as one who hath a key and doth open." His mission was to set up a new democratic

society in what he conceived to be the simplicity of the earliest days, among whom worship should be in silence and in spirit amid the plainest surroundings.

But he did not come to an assured conviction of his life's work without times and moods of desperate despondency, when he seemed to be tempted and harassed by unseen agencies. But his faith never wavered, and he soon recovered his serene conviction that the power of God was over all. He lived a most abstemious life always, a threepenny loaf once lasting him three weeks, and his drink was water or, when he was ill, with wormwood in it. He walked much alone and passed the night in fields and solitary places, or retired, like his Great Exemplar, to high mountains. Here he prayed and pondered on spiritual things. It was soon opened to him that God did not dwell in churches, and that it was believers and not buildings that constituted a Church. Like Ezekiel, he had a vision of a great shaking of the earth—the hearts of the people being shaken before the Seed of God sprung up in them.

When peace came into his soul after his doubts and despairs (though these attacked him again at times), he felt that he was come in spirit through the flaming sword into the Paradise of God, and was as Adam before he fell, wherein he was united with the Eternal. A high claim indeed, but his life justified it. As he said of himself: "What I was in words, the same was I in life." We cannot convict him in all the records we have of him of any lapse from virtue whatever. He always forgave his persecutors, leaving them to God to deal with as He thought right, offered his cheek to the smiter not in metaphor but literally, not once but many times; bore his intense and utterly unmerited sufferings and sorrows with incomparable fortitude and optimism, never mitigating them one jot by any sacrifice of principle or conviction or any attempt to ingratiate himself by word or deed with those who had power over him. He never seems to have called in a doctor, though often extremely ill and held to be dying.

He looked upon himself as sent by God to preach repentance to all like John the Baptist, and to raise his voice against oppression and injustice and all kinds of abuses. He admonished judges on the Bench, clergy in their pulpits, soldiers on duty, the King on his throne. He was perfectly fearless in his integrity and innocence. A soldier, seeing him suffer ill-treatment so patiently and forgivingly, said: "I see that you are a man"; and at Scarborough the officers, after seeing his dauntless demeanour, said: "He is as stiff as a tree, and as pure as a bell; we could never move him."

But withal he was no dreamer or mystic, but a practical

leader of men and an organizer, with a shrewd eye for the legal mistakes of his persecutors. He was not learned, though he seems to have known Hebrew and Welsh, but he could hold his own in argument with the cleverest clerks and lawyers. The Bible he could quote as if it lay open before him while he spoke. "He acquitted himself," says Penn, "like a man, a new and heavenly-minded man, a divine and a naturalist, and all of God's almighty making." He was emphatically a man of peace and never lifted his hand against any man and, when accused of plotting treason, said he had "never learnt any warlike postures." But the Quakers were not at first against all war. Many Friends served in the army till Cromwell dismissed them. It was only later that the Society declared against the use of force.

In organizing the Society of Friends he made it a cardinal point to employ all the members, men and women, according to the special gifts of each in the work of evangelization and in the administration of the Church of God. But even in this young Society there were backsliders and innovators who wrung his very soul, or, as he says of other things, "struck at his life." But he triumphed over all obstacles in the strength, as he always said, of God and His Christ. He always acted under the personal direction of the Lord Who spoke to his soul. Amongst his last words were: "I am fully clear: the Seed of God reigns." And, "Never heed. The Lord's power is over all weakness and death. Blessed be the Lord."

Fox excelled in prayer, as might be expected of one who had pondered so much over the deep things of God, and had fasted and communed with his own spirit in solitude. William Penn says of him: "The most awful living reverent frame I ever felt or beheld was his in prayer." He notes the weight, reverence, solemnity of his address and demeanour, and the fewness and fulness of his words.

The picture of Fox, by Sir Peter Lely, reproduced in this volume, portrays a remarkable personality. The eyes are a most striking feature. "Don't pierce me with your eyes," said one disputant to him. The nose is big, straight, fleshy and powerful. The mouth firm, even grim, the chin set forward and resolute. The hair is parted in the middle and worn rather long. Thomas Elwood says he was graceful in countenance, manly in personage, grave in gesture; that he was courteous, instructive, unaffected, forgiving, though a severe reprover of hardened sinners. And William Penn remarks: "Truly I must say that though God had visibly clothed him with a divine preference and authority, and indeed his very presence expressed a religious majesty, yet he never abused it,

but held his place in the Church of God with a most engaging humility. I never saw him out of his place, or not a match for every service and occasion."

Fox was far in advance of his age in many social questions. Apprenticeship, registration of unemployed, municipal responsibility for the poor, blind, and lame, reform of jails, equal justice for poor and rich, the rights of women (whom many reckoned at that time as without souls), religious toleration, temperance in drink and tobacco—he was for all these; and he was against capital punishment for thieves and witches, and against slavery.

Friends were early called Quakers from the shaking and trembling produced on hearers by the message of God, when the "day of the Lord" was sounded in their ears. Gervase Bennett first gave them the name, because they bid him tremble at the word of God. On one occasion (says Fox, p. 87) "the Power of the Lord was dreadful amongst them in the steeple-house (*i.e.*, church), so that the people trembled and shook." Some even thought the building shook. The day of Pentecost seemed to have come again.

But what distinguished the Quakers to the vulgar eye was not the silence at their meetings, the "mumbing and dumbing," as one scoffer called it, or their aversion from steeple-houses and hireling ministers who officiated for pay, so much as their refusing to doff their hats before man, their use of *Thou* and *Thee*, and their refusal to take any oath. The establishment of these peculiarities really gave a cachet to the new Society, much as the very opposite regulations of the Salvation Army—viz., noise, uniforms, public prayers and hymns—have done something to bring this sect into notice.

Nine-tenths of the persecution which Fox underwent was due to his preaching in churches, and refusing to doff his hat or swear. But both Cromwell and Charles II. humoured him in the hat matter. The latter, when Penn stood before him "unbonneted," took off his own hat, remarking with pleasant humour, that in his presence only one person was allowed to wear his hat. Whenever the charges of blasphemy, heresy, seduction, or treason against Fox failed, or the indictment was proved to be faulty in law, a hostile magistrate always fell back upon the Oath of Allegiance or Abjuration to put him back into prison, though acquitted. Yet, as Fox well put it—and the saying "caught on"—"I am given the Bible to swear on, a book that commands me not to swear."

Fox was no mystic in the true sense, but, like the prophets of old, he received direct guidance from God, and he saw visions and prophesied the Fire of London, the restoration of the King,

and the dissolving of the Long Parliament, and the ebbing of the Turkish power in Europe (p. 235). Some of the cures he effected cannot be called anything but miraculous; such as that of the dying woman at Baldock (p. 125), the woman whom Satan had bound for fourteen years (p. 342), the man thrown from his horse in America and taken up for dead with dislocated neck (p. 293), and especially the cure of a boy of eleven still in his cradle and bent almost double, completely restored in a few weeks (p. 92). He also healed many distracted persons.

Fox's preaching and miracles converted many among the priests and higher classes—*e.g.*, Lady Montague, Lady Margaret Hamilton, members of Cromwell's household, and the Princess Elizabeth, granddaughter of James I. One of his earliest converts was Judge Fell, whose widow he married, of Swarthmoor Hall.

His industry was astonishing. He wrote innumerable pamphlets, letters, exhortations, and protests. Though very much broken in health, he travelled up and down England and visited Scotland, Ireland, the West Indies, America, Holland, and Germany. An astonishing man indeed!

Now we must take reluctant leave of this man, who combined in his character many of the qualities of hero, saint, apostle, and martyr. He laboured unceasingly, indomitably, for the good of all men and the Gospel of Christ. What he accomplished by teaching and example was marvellous, but, had he not been sore let and hindered by evil men, how much more he could have done! But the seed he sowed is still rooted, and may yet grow into something we know not of.

"He died as he lived a lamb," says Penn (on the 13th of 11th month, 1690), "minding the things of God to the last in a universal spirit." Robert Barrow records his death: "There was no sign of any great pain upon him. He shut up his eyes and mouth himself, and his chin never fell again, but he lay as if he had been fallen asleep. One would have thought he had smiled." Surely "a heavenly and harmonious conclusion" for this servant of God.

C. R. Haines.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Among contributors to the present issue, Mr. R. E. Gordon George is a Roman Catholic layman, domiciled for some time recently in Italy, and deeply interested in the cause of Reunion. Mr. C. R. Haines is a former Uppingham master, and author of a charming study of General Gordon; we reviewed a few months ago his *Heathen Contact with Christianity during its First Century and a Half*. Canon Newsom, who writes on Baron von Hügel's religious philosophy, is Vicar of Newcastle-on-Tyne, and was for some years Professor of Pastoral Theology at King's College.

The note published below on "The simple *fractio panis*" was written before the Rev. Wilfred Knox's full discussion of the same subject in *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem* had appeared. We trust that the note may send our readers to this book. The review we publish to-day from Dr. Nairne will show them how good it is.

We regret three errors in the August number of Theology. In the Dean of Winchester's article at the bottom of page 71 "Red Sea" was a misprint for "Dead Sea." In Mr. Porter's article "William Scott" on page 96 should have been "Thomas Scott," and "Samuel Wilberforce" on page 97 should have been "William Wilberforce." We are indebted to Dr. Eugene Stock for the two last-named corrections.

A correspondent writes to say that he has always been accustomed to refuse to believe in the bodily Assumption of our Lady, and that Mr. Lowther Clarke's Note in our last issue appeared to bear him out; but that the article in the same issue by Mr. Groves on the Transfiguration, illustrating from the cases of Enoch, Elijah, and Moses the principle that "death is not the natural end of man," seems to put a new complexion on the matter. And he asks for our comment. We reply:

1. We hesitate to accept Mr. Groves's principle, so far as physical death is concerned. That death would have been very differently conditioned, had man not "fallen from his first estate," and that it would have been exempt from those experiences of loss, nullity, and desolation which now belong to it, we can well believe; but we find it difficult to believe that the emergence of man into spiritual relationships should have exempted him on his physical side from the mortality which appears to attach to all animate organisms. We did, in fact, put this point to Mr. Groves before accepting his article; but he did not agree.

2. With regard to the illustrations, the "translation" of Enoch is described in Heb. xi. 5 in words which, as Dr. Nairne says, need mean no more than "a calm and holy death." Of Moses it is repeatedly said that he "died" (Deut. xxxii. 50, xxxiv. 5; Josh. i. 1). The "assumption" of Elijah is in a different category. It belongs to the series of Elisha-stories used by the redactor of 2 Kings, which Kautzsch describes as "a historical source of exceeding value" despite a considerable "legendary element" (*Literature of Old Testament*, p. 41 *f.*). Application to these narratives of the canons applied to mystical experiences by earlier writers

like St. Theresa as well as by theologians of our own times will probably show the word "legendary" to be in important ways misleading: the whole narrative moves in the sphere of ecstasy and prophetic vision. But this in itself should warn us against literalness in interpretation.

3. Newman's observation about the Assumption, that "it was becoming she should be taken up into heaven," is an example of a type of argument which Dr. E. A. Abbott has named "The Fallacy of the Fitness of Things" (*St. Thomas of Canterbury*, I., §§ 375, 388). It may be, or have been, "becoming" that a thing should have happened; and of that kind of purely subjective congruity the stories of Enoch and Elijah may be taken perhaps as examples. But only historical evidence can give us assurance that the thing did in fact happen.

NOTE

A MARXIAN VIEW OF CHRISTIANITY

KARL KAUTSKY is a prominent figure in international Socialism and has conducted a controversy with Lenin and Trotsky. His book on the origins of Christianity, which was published in 1908 and is in its thirteenth German edition, has now appeared in an English translation.* Regarded as a contribution to New Testament study its value is very small; but its significance for contemporary history is great. Here we have "the Marxian conception of history" applied to Our Lord and His Church. Misleading and absurd as it appears to Christian scholars, millions of men accept it on authority as a scientific explanation.

From Dr. Shadwell's most valuable book on *The Socialist Movement*† we derive the following summary.

Marxianism as an economic system is discredited by serious thinkers, but the class-war formula lives on. Primitive society is assumed without proof to have been Communistic. At some period which cannot be precisely ascertained the original system broke up and the law of social evolution began to operate. This law works "with the inevitability of a law of nature" (*naturnotwendig*) and is otherwise called "the materialistic conception of history." Class struggle is the key to history, and in all ages the conflict between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is the dominant factor. Social evolution is "scientific,"‡ and the Social Revolution inevitable (I. 164-174). The rich are continually becoming richer, and the misery of the poor continually increases (I. 189). The New International, founded at Hamburg in 1923, accepts the Marxian class-struggle as its basis (II. 87). Clearly the materialistic conception of history is incompatible with belief in a divine power. "A real Marxian is always an atheist" (II. 157). While British Labour is politically strong in so far as it is Reformist and repudiates Marxianism, its official connexion with the New International justifies us in taking Kautsky's book seriously.

The author claims that one who has taken part in the class struggles of his own day has an insight into the past which is denied to bourgeois scholars. However, he uses their results and does not conduct researches for himself. He is largely dependent on Pfleiderer, sometimes even on

* *Foundations of Christianity*, by K. Kautsky. Allen and Unwin, 16s.

† 2 vols. Philip Allan, 1925.

‡ "*Wissenschaftlich*," however, has a wider meaning than "scientific."

Strauss. The New Testament writings are assigned to late dates which have long ago been abandoned.

The world into which Jesus came was one in which the class-struggle was acute. Capitalism had accumulated enormous fortunes for the rich, and the poor, dragged down to the level of slaves, were inspired by fury against their oppressors, and despaired of a remedy. The world was ripe for a proletarian movement. Galilee in the first century A.D. was utterly unlike Renan's idyllic picture. It resembled rather Paris during the Commune of May, 1871. Jesus was a rebel. His recorded utterances, when disentangled from the later glosses, show a savage class hatred against the rich. The story of the two swords in St Luke, and the otherwise inexplicable betrayal of a secret by Judas, show that a *coup d'état* was contemplated.

The original congregations were proletarian—see 1 Cor. i. 26 and the Epistle of James. They favoured the mitigation of the slave's lot—naturally, as they were not slave-owners themselves; but they set back emancipation by giving a religious sanction to the slave's obedience. Despair of improving the present order led them to emphasize the other world. Their monotheism was a natural reflection in speculation of the political unity of the Empire, as later the nine orders of angels reflected the nine orders of nobles at Constantine's court. Communism, as practised at Jerusalem in the early days, remained the ideal, though it was a communism of consumption, not of production. Christianity for a long time drew its adherents mainly from the *Lumpenproletariat* (free parasitic population) of the big towns. When their slender resources were exhausted they were compelled to seek rich converts, and to modify their original hatred of wealth. This explains how a proletarian movement became eventually bourgeois. Cæsarism and Napoleonism similarly began as democratic movements.

Kautsky writes as an atheist, but his explanation of the Church's growth concedes a good deal to the other side. Christianity offered hope to the miserable slave-gangs. Domestic slaves, minions of their masters, whose vices they shared, were " full of a longing for a new, purer, higher life " (p. 70), and so turned to Christ. The old were captured through their fear of death, young aristocrats through their disgust of life (p. 418). But why should all these things have happened unless Christianity offered a reality and not a mirage ? And if atheists believe in " a new, purer, higher life," then they are not far from us. Their atheism is formal and due to radical misconceptions of Christianity. Frequent references in Kautsky's book show that Christianity is associated in his mind with the pre-war Prussian State Church.

We need not delay over the assertion that Jesus was a rebel. The great output of pacificist literature in recent years may be consulted by anyone who needs arguments with which to reply. The Society of Friends and their sympathisers take Our Lord's words about non-resistance literally and explain away the few passages on which Kautsky relies. We may think their position illogical, but it is far preferable to Kautsky's method of concentrating on a few sayings and ignoring the bulk of Our Lord's teaching. A reader familiar with the Gospel teaching on Rich and Poor may think that the modern Church pays insufficient attention to the denunciations of riches, but, if he is candid, he will own that very careful statement is necessary and that " class-hatred " is not found in St Luke, on which alone Kautsky relies.

Then was the early Church really proletarian ?* When St Paul said that "not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble, are called" (1 Cor. i. 26), the natural meaning is that there are a few. St James, who is relied upon to prove class-hatred, is evidence for the presence of some rich men in the Church (ii. 1-3). St Paul's Epistles were meant to be read at assemblies of the brethren and presuppose a general level of intelligence which we should be glad to have in our modern congregations.

Marxian economics are utterly discredited. The theory of value, according to which the value of an article is the amount of labour bestowed on its making, is ridiculous. Nothing is easier than to make an article for which there is little or no demand, and which therefore is valueless. Marx's economic interpretation of history is equally wrong, if only because no one formula can explain the complexities of human life. Is there anything to be said for the theory that Christianity arose in a period of exceptional misery, to which it was the automatic response ? The economic miseries leading up to and accompanying the break-up of the Empire in the West are familiar to all, but long before they had reached their height Christianity was firmly established. Among the causes of ruin were civil wars, military and bureaucratic extravagance imposing excessive taxes upon a declining population, the development of centrifugal tendencies in the provinces, perhaps malaria, certainly the exhausted fertility of the soil. If the civil wars which followed Nero's death are excluded, none of these causes were so potent in the first and second centuries as in the third and fourth. The general impression one gets is that the peace and security guaranteed by Augustus, and later by the Flavian Emperors, made the period when Christianity became established one of relative prosperity.

Mr. W. W. Tarn has a striking chapter on the social problem in the third century B.C. in *The Hellenistic Age* (2nd edition, Cambridge, 1925), founded mainly on the accounts of the Temple at Delos. This century brought prosperity to the upper classes, but for the poor it meant that prices were up and wages down. The secularization of the Temple treasures at Athens, Delphi, and elsewhere had caused a rise in prices before Alexander. Great economic disturbance resulted from Alexander's release of the Persian treasures, which amounted to perhaps 360,000 talents in coin and bullion. (Athens began the Peloponnesian War with 6,000 talents.) Though it was not understood at the time, this vast increase of gold and silver without a corresponding increase of commodities made prices rise.

The price of wheat is the best index to the economic position. Prior to the famine-year 329 B.C. the price at Athens was 5 drachmæ a bushel. This and the Delos price can be reckoned as the world-price, for both cities imported corn by sea. A skilled labourer at Athens was paid $2\frac{1}{2}$ drachmæ a day. By 300 wheat at Delos had risen to 10 drachmæ, and during the third century never fell so low as 5. Conditions at Delos were so favourable that workmen flocked there from the other islands. The nominal wage was 2 drachmæ a day for skilled labour, half that sum for unskilled. But employment was intermittent. A certain Olympus, who in 302 got more employment than any one else, made from 200 to 240 drachmæ a year. Certain skilled workmen compounded for 240

* The *proletariat* in Ancient Rome were those who served the State only by having offspring (*proles*). Socialist writers do not intend this *nuance* when they use the word.

drachmæ a year in preference to the higher but uncertain daily wage. Clearly, then, a skilled labourer in the first half of the second century could not earn more than two-thirds of a drachma as a daily average, while wheat was 5 to 10 drachmæ a bushel (pp. 118-125).

Turning to New Testament times, we find that the rate for casual labour was a *denarion* (roughly equivalent to a drachma) a day (Matt. xx. 2). Dr. Bennett in Hastings' *D.B.* v. 359 states that wheat in New Testament times cost 16 to 20 shillings a quarter. Reducing this to *denaria* (pre-war francs), we get 20 to 25 *denaria* a quarter, say 3 to 4 a bushel. Dr. Charles in his note on Revelation vi. 6 says that a *chœnix* was a day's consumption of grain, soldiers being allowed double. A *denarion* in times of famine bought two *chœnices* of wheat. At other times it bought 8, 12 or 16 times as much. A *chœnix* is variously given as $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 pints. If we reckon it as 2 pints, and give the figures in bushels, a bushel costs 2 to 4 *denaria* in normal times, a result near enough to Dr. Bennett's. The labourer's wage, therefore, went twice as far in the Roman Empire of the first century A.D. as in Delos of the third century B.C.

We conclude that Kautsky's main thesis is incorrect.

W. K. L. Clarke.

"FIRST EVENSONG"

Under cover of an improved Lectionary (that of 1922) a new Kalendar has been introduced and new obligations sought to be imposed. One of the more serious of these novelties is "First Evensong," for which proper Lessons are now provided, and an examination of the scheme suggests that the Revisers have attributed to "First Evensong" the liturgical dignity formerly attached to "First Vespers" in the Breviary system. This service, with Lessons and first collect of the feast, is claimed to be justified by the rubric of 1661: "The collect appointed for every Sunday or for any holy-day that hath a vigil or eve, shall be said at the evening service next before."

The system of canonical hours as set out in the Latin Breviaries, whether "secular" or otherwise, is undoubtedly of monastic origin. The pre-monastic or ecclesiastical office seems to have consisted of no more than a morning and an evening service, *Gallicinium* or *Matutini Hymni* and *Lucernare*, whether the day were festival or otherwise. But, as Easter possessed a night service, or *Pervigilium*, so other feasts came to be similarly prepared for—*e.g.*, those of certain martyrs, the Nativity, and Pentecost. In the tenth century, we are told, a vigil fast-day was substituted for vigil night service. The *Pervigilium* ended with Mass, and so the vigil day had also its Mass, said late on account of the fast, and the observance ended with Vespers. As a rule, feasts added since the disuse of the *Pervigilium* have no vigil.

In the monastic scheme a festival was considered to begin (ritually) with Vespers. This may have been copied from the current Jewish custom of beginning all Sabbaths at sundown, as prescribed by the Law for the Day of Atonement; or it may be due to the erroneous but popular reading of the first chapter of Genesis, which makes the "day" consist of "the evening and the morning," which it obviously does not.

In the Breviary scheme the First Vespers are not dependent on the

vigil. The latter has its Vespers, and although this service becomes "First Vespers" of the feast, yet the collect is the vigil collect. When there is no vigil, the "First Vespers" take the collect of the morrow.

But it is said that although a feast may not have a vigil, yet it always has an "eve." The distinction is purely arbitrary. There is no Latin word for "eve" except *vigilia*. Popularly, every celebration or public date is said to have an "eve." But here, again, the French term is "veille," *vigilia*. The expression is borrowed from the Church Kalendar, wherein, however, some celebrations have no vigil and therefore no eve. The rubric above referred to can only be interpreted, as regards "vigil or eve," by the table of fasts previously given, in which the "eves or vigils" before certain days are specified. Here, the terms are evidently synonymous, and whatever position we assign to the collect ordered by the rubric to be said, such collect is not to be said "at the evening service next before" unless the day be Saturday or one of the "vigils or eves" specified in the table. Easter Even is, of course, peculiar. It has its own Lessons and collect right through, and there can be no such service as "First Evensong of Easter Day." Nor can there be any "First Evensong" for the second of two consecutive holy-days; and if the former of the two is not one of those which "hath a vigil or eve," there can be no "First Evensong" of this either, *according to the rubric*.

Moreover, if the rubric is to be read as bringing in this Evensong, why does the new Lectionary make no provision for Saturdays? Some years ago, when the subject was being pressed in certain quarters, the whole virtue and importance of "First Evensong" was declared to be founded upon the necessity of a proper service on Saturday evening. It is astonishing, also, that so scholarly a production as the "Green Book" should exhibit this popular error and set up a false discrimination between "vigil" and "eve," allowing feasts which have no vigil (and therefore no eve) to have an "eve" nevertheless, in order to bring in "First Evensong."

It must furthermore be remembered that Evensong bears a very different relation to the service of the day from that borne by Vespers (with or without Compline). Vespers occupies only a small proportion of the common psalmody and practically none of the day's legenda; whereas Evensong or evening prayer occupies one-half of each. To annex a seventh of the day's service to that of the morrow was a small thing, and very different from the proposed annexation of one-half.

The makers of the Prayer Book, by pooling the psallenda and legenda of the seven or eight "hours" and dividing the result into two equal halves, for morning and evening respectively, unconsciously reverted to the ancient ecclesiastical and pre-monastic system of morning and evening prayer; and it seems evident that all other day services, of what kind soever, must be held between these two, after Mattins and before Evensong, *according to the Prayer Book*. The customary "early celebration," when it precedes Mattins, is thus outside the prescript order, and has the character of a "private" or voluntary Mass.

Saturday has long been considered as the quasi-vigil or eve of Sunday, although the fast was perhaps never observed in this country. Hence the bells were rung at midday, as on vigils, to announce the half-holiday. But as there was no real vigil, the collect at Vespers was that of the morrow, whereas an actual vigil had always a collect of its own at all services, as Easter Eve has with us. The morning of the vigil was probably

a work-time, but the afternoon and evening constituted a half-holiday, beginning with the Mass. The revisers of 1661 may be credited with a desire of re-establishing half-holidays by ordering the collect of the Sunday or feast to be said " at the evening service "; but they can hardly be credited with the intention to restore " First Vespers," seeing that the rubric applies only to vigils or eves and Saturdays, and not all feasts were allotted vigils or eves.

To sum up, the attempt to bring in " First Evensong " must be described as a " corrupt following " of medieval use, inconsistent with the reformed ritual and order, and, indeed, quite unnecessary. If, however, there be a demand for a ritual preparation on the day before great feasts, why not anticipate Mattins on such occasions, and so prevent the morning office from being crowded out by the additional Communions on these days ? This would be consonant with ancient use, for, according to Sarum, Mattins of the day following were said at the hour of Vespers on the day before Trinity Sunday, Corpus Christi, Nativity of St. John Baptist, SS. Peter and Paul, Translation of St. Thomas, Feast of Relics, Feast of Dedication, and Feast of the Place respectively.

A. E. Alston.

THE SIMPLE "FRACTIO PANIS"

In a volume entitled *Some Problems of the New Testament*, by the Rev. A. Wright, it is contended that the custom of sharing a loaf was originated by our Lord Himself, and that He practised it habitually with His disciples as a token of fellowship and unity. The Gospels show Him breaking the bread at the miracle of the loaves, at the Last Supper, and after His Resurrection at Emmaus. The last case is illuminating, for the two disciples had not witnessed the true institution of the Eucharist. The unknown Stranger breaks the loaf, and this action, unusual but to them familiar, brings this flash of recognition.

My purpose is to carry this study a little further.

It is not stated that at Emmaus the meal had actually begun; reference to the miracle of the loaves indicates that Christ was " saying grace " by the blessing and Fraction, and we may suggest that He was accustomed thus to inaugurate the meal.

The obvious lesson was fellowship, but rich values were implicit under this. The life-giving bread, now an oblation through prayer, must be broken for distribution; it has gathered in many grains, and now by reception gathers the company into its life, and into unity, unto the duty of love.

All is purely symbolic and largely implicit, but it constituted a preparatory training for the coming Sacrament, in whose higher truth and power would be found the fulfilment.

There are traces of this custom in the Acts of the Apostles. The second chapter contains two allusions to the breaking of bread. In verse 42 it is connected with " the prayers," and the reference may well be to the Holy Eucharist.

But in verse 46 the writer continues by speaking about meals; " breaking bread from house to house (or at home) [they] did eat their meat in gladness and singleness of heart." This seems to have more of a social

significance. There were common meals, or Agapæ, opened with the simple *Fractio Panis*, and at certain times the more solemn Fraction followed.

The term "breaking of bread," therefore, is a phrase wider than the Eucharist, but including it, and the passage in Acts ii. 46 cannot be taken as proof of a daily celebration.

When St. Paul, accompanied by two fellow-Christians, is in the midst of the shipwreck, he exhorts the crew to eat and himself sets the example. He blesses and breaks a loaf, tastes, and, according to the Western text, "gave also to us."

Some have considered this a Eucharist, but it is hardly likely. We should notice the emphatic "*began* to eat." It is the Christian opening of a meal.

The first clear distinction, then, between the two Fractions is that the simple one preceded the supper, while that of the Eucharist, when used, followed it.

Let us consider the value of the custom: shortly after Pentecost the Apostles find themselves surrounded at Jerusalem by a multitude of Christians. There are only twelve ministers, and no places of worship except private houses. The large numbers must have been almost unmanageable. Can all communicate on any one Sunday? And do they need no training for the Holy Eucharist?

But if they can be grouped for Agapæ and laymen can perform the simple Fraction, here is a beginning with solid values, to which more can be added as it becomes possible.

It is unlikely that the same problem as regards numbers ever occurred so suddenly elsewhere, but some training would be always desirable.

Furthermore, infant Churches arose where no regular ministry existed for some time, as in Crete (Tit. i. 5). What happened here about the Eucharist? We know nothing, but we can see that such an Agape with lay ministries might supply a temporary want and be a useful preparation.

The Didache gives brief prayers for blessing a cup and a broken loaf (κλάσμα) with a longer form for use "after being filled." The latter is most nearly related to the later Anaphoras, and it is at least possible that the former are for the simple Fraction with a corresponding cup.

We may suppose that each person or party brings provisions and that there is an Offertory in kind. One (or more) of the offered loaves serves for the Fraction. After the supper the final prayer is said, perhaps on occasion being used or adapted to consecrate the Sacrament.

It is possible that the Didache, in its completed form, witnesses to the separation of Agape and Eucharist, for a separate section follows about breaking bread on the Lord's Day and refers to Mal. i. 11.

Passing on a century or more after the Didache, we reach the probable date of the "Egyptian Church Order," about A.D. 230. It exists in several versions with minute fragments of the original Greek. In this Order there are allusions to the Agape, both formal and informal. If no minister is present there is no Fraction, for it is forbidden to any one under the rank of deacon. The Ethiopic version is the most explicit. The broken bread is to be received before the supper is eaten. It is regarded as a sacramental and sent to the sick; it is called Eulogia, and carefully distinguished from the Eucharist.

While the loaf is apparently sometimes offered at the time of supper, the Ethiopic version, perhaps, implies the use of one previously offered—*i.e.*, at the Eucharistic Offertory.

The " Testament of our Lord " is a later adaptation of the " Egyptian Church Order," and here again we find a brief reference to this custom at the Agape.

The rule as to catechumens varied: the Didache forbids them to receive the Eulogia (if such it is), but does not explicitly forbid their presence at the supper.

" The Egyptian Church Order " forbids their eating with the believers, but allows them the " bread of blessing," or " bread of exorcism " (Latin version). Perhaps the latter is a different form of the Eulogia.

The " Testament " forbids it to catechumens at the Agape, but allows it prior to their dismissal from the Easter celebration.

The Agape gradually declined, but the loaves offered at the Eucharistic Offertory continued to be used as Eulogia in other ways.

The Editor has kindly furnished me with an instance of its modern survival in Brittany, where some family in a village offers each Sunday a basketful of broken bread, which early in the Mass is blessed by the priest. It is then distributed by a layman to every member of the congregation during the singing of the Kyrie, Gloria, or Creed.

The argument used above as to the value of the custom in Apostolic times depends in part on the hypothesis that a layman could make the simple Fraction.

There is no evidence for this, but its restriction later to at least the diaconate may well have been a development due to the quasi-sacramental character which the Eulogia acquired.

T. E. S. Ferris.

REVIEWS

ST. PAUL AND THE CHURCH OF JERUSALEM. By Wilfred L. Knox, M.A. Cambridge University Press. 18s.

In a modest preface Mr Knox tells us that he composed most of his book in the intervals of parochial work in London. Perhaps that is what gives it such life and actuality. The Introduction explains its plan:—

"The primary sources for the period of the life of S. Paul during which he was in active personal contact with the Church of Jerusalem are the letters written by him to his converts in Galatia and at Thessalonica and Corinth": and here it may be noted at once that Mr Knox puts *Galatians* earliest of the Epistles, just before the council at Jerusalem, and that few will hesitate to accept this dating when they read the whole story as he imagines, presents and abundantly documents it. He goes on: "Second only to these letters stands the book known as the Acts of the Apostles. It might seem natural to examine here the much-debated question of its origin, date and method of composition." But "to attempt such an examination would simply be to anticipate the greater part of the narrative given in the text of this book and the reasons stated in the notes for believing that narrative to be correct." In short chapters the story is told. The narrative of *Acts* is closely followed; but this is fitted in with that; a good deal is read between the lines; it is argued that S. Luke's way of writing lends itself peculiarly to such treatment. After each chapter many pages of copious notes are added. These are full to the brim of sane and solid matter, the fruit of wide reading and patient selective thought; here are the sinews of the argument. A lazy reader might go through a few chapters and put the book aside as mere imagination commended by no grace of style. Let him however emulate in a slight degree the diligence of the author and read the notes through leisurely and ponderingly; then he will start again, studying this time, and will read on to the end with ever growing zest and delighted attention. I who am honoured with the writing of this notice, read the book so, and went to tell the author how much I liked it. He was in his garden, for he cultivates the anglo-catholic art of gardening, and as I walked home from my pleasant visit I thought of his glorious black tulips and how they were a kind of type of his book; queer at first sight, then interesting as the outcome of patient elaboration, finally impressive.

He owes a good deal to Professor Kirsopp Lake's *Earlier*

Epistles. The debt, which is fully discharged, is mainly in respect to the position of the Hellenists in the Jewish and the Christian Church. His enquiries into this question lead him to an inverted Tübingen theory: the history is all shaped by a petrine and pauline antagonism in the church. But to the Tübingen critics *Acts* was the sequel of that stress, a late-written piece of reconciliation; to Mr Knox, telling the story from *Acts* with delicate erudite touches, *Acts* in its integrity appears and is by him displayed as witness of the early state of things and speaking from the midst of it. *Acts*, (we note), " in its integrity ": for very soon indeed this fresh truthfulness began to be impaired. Loisy (of whom Mr Knox has not much to say) has distinguished what he considers an excellent original from a garbled edition of *Acts* which became canonical. Mr Knox ends his Introduction with a lengthy examination of the D or Bezan text. To him *Acts* in the (roughly) Westcott and Hort text is the original and D is the garbling editor, though not the rascal of Loisy's rather bitter fancy. " The real interest of D lies in the fact that it reveals to us a period when the Church was sufficiently interested in the books of the New Testament to transcribe them, but at the same time felt perfectly free to alter and transcribe them. In other words they are regarded as interesting but not as inspired texts. Fortunately the period was a brief one, and consequently the documents have not been rendered worthless by attempted improvements which obscure their true text. A few more editors of D's calibre would have rendered the Acts utterly worthless as an account of Christian origins. Incidentally it is of interest to note that the whole situation of affairs which S. Luke writes for has vanished at the time when he was edited by D; for it is precisely his somewhat obscure allusions to that situation that D is most fond of improving." The palmary example is D's reduction of the decree of the council at Jerusalem, so peculiar by the circumstances of its first framing, to the roomier piety of the settled church; but Mr Knox also collects eight pages full of less obvious examples.

The very many pages of notes require careful attention: the first reading of the book is no holiday task. But when this task has been faithfully accomplished the author will have won the reader's confidence, and the reader will have perceived that a fresh view of the early church's progress in faith and discipline is being opened. As yet he scarcely takes it in as a whole; but now comes the reward of honest studying. Now he will start again, reading the story (in the large print) right on, refusing to turn aside to the notes. By this time his curiosity for the truth of history will be so strong that he will

need some strength of mind in sticking to this determination; but he must do so. He has trimmed his sails on the other tack now. He flies before the wind, and swiftly overtakes the clear understanding he desires—*in portum uoluntatis*. Every one knows—but will indulgently allow a reviewer to quote again—Renan's eulogy of *Acts:* "The gaiety, the youthfulness of heart which breaks through these gospel odyssees were something new and original and magical. The Acts of the Apostles expressing that first impulse of the christian conscience is a book of joy, of ardour serene. Since the homeric poems no one had seen a work of such fresh feeling. A breeze of morning, a smell of sea, if I dare say such things, inspiring something quick and strong, penetrates the whole book and makes it an excellent travelling companion, the choice breviary of one who hunts old traces on the southern seas. That was the second poesy of Christianity. The lake of Tiberias and the fishermen's boats had given the first."

But Renan could not trust *Acts* for history. "*Acts*, he sums up, written about 80 A.D., is a dogmatic history, designed to endorse the orthodoxy of the period, the piety of that good catholic its author."

Well: Mr Knox thinks he can produce the substance of what we would still fain hope, the evidence of what Renan with all his affection could not see. He has no pretty bits like Renan, no style of noble purity. It is a pity he should just miss the nobility of a good plain style. He so nearly attains it, especially in the earlier chapters. But from business-like he almost condescends to business-man-like with his abbreviation "Jno." for "John" and his perpetual "the fact that" for "since" or "because." Perhaps however it is worse taste to notice such lapses than to commit them. At any rate the sentences are clear, the connexions logical, the effect persuasive; and what more would one insist upon? There is a subtle skill too; for instance in the steadily developed portrayal of S. Paul's character, so shrewd as well as ardent, unscrupulous in forcing his righteous purpose, but within the lines that become a grand seigneur, not otherwise: now and again we quietly chuckle as we read; yet quickly turn serious again; for the great righteous purpose is ever present, God is making history.

The main problem about S. Paul will, I fancy, look really different after studying Mr Knox to many who have hitherto felt oppressed by it. Is our Christian faith from our Lord Jesus or from S. Paul? Compare the Galilean Gospels with S. Paul's Epistles. Then think about the deity and eternity of Christ, the doctrine of the cross, of forgiveness through the cross, of

atonement and salvation and resurrection. Does Paul inherit, or did he bring in something new, something of "another kind"? Mr Knox bids us add Acts to Gospels and Epistles, and read Acts very carefully again. He reminds us of this plain but often forgotten fact: viz., that the judaic Christians opposed Paul fiercely in his bringing in of the Gentiles and his treatment of the Law, but there is no record anywhere of objection to his tremendous doctrines of the person and saving work of Christ. And then Mr Knox backs his reminder with those elaborate notes of his, and shews what most knew vaguely, but now see with lively personal impression, that Paul's doctrine was no modernism but quite a natural completion of judaic faith, running out on lines by which all hellenistic Jews must shape, at just that time, their thought. "The framework of Saul's theology was thus outwardly an adaptation of ideas familiar to Judaism. In fact however it was largely influenced by the speculations of Oriental religions, which had penetrated either directly or through the medium of Hellenistic philosophy into the Judaism of the Dispersion. . . . Saul in his theology borrowed freely from this circle of ideas. None the less his teaching was sharply separated from theirs by his insistence on the exclusive claim of Judaism as the true revelation of God to man, and still more by his identification of the divine redeemer with the historical person of Jesus and the proved fact of His Resurrection."

The objection may be raised that *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem* breaks off before the captivity and the epistles of the captivity. What if *Colossians* and *Ephesians* came in? Are these so different from *Romans* that we must either read more into *Romans* than Mr Knox allows, or decide that these later epistles are not S. Paul's? Either way it would seem that we are inheritors of a Christianity which is not the simple gospel preached and believed in Galilea.

I think Mr Knox could meet this objection, indeed does meet it without professing to do so in his present narrative and notes. It is not his way to argue, but to tell the story; and I think that those who appreciate rightly the story he has told will see that *Colossians* and *Ephesians* are part of the continuation of the one unbroken story. At least they will be prepared to consider that continuation with intelligent sympathy and an enlarged purview.

Mr Knox is not always right in what he says. Few will be convinced by the quotations and ratiocinations with which he tries to prove that *ecclesia* often means the rulers or representatives of a church as distinguished from the Christian *plebs*, and there are some who will not be satisfied that his principles

of textual criticism are always sound, or even that he always goes by "principles" at all. But these doubtful points are neither many nor, for a broad judgment, important. It would tend to a false impression of the book to dwell on them. And for my part I am anxious to leave a true impression on any one who reads this brief review, and to win readers for the book itself. It is an unpretentious and solid book. As was once said of Dr Stanton's work, "There is meat in it."

A. NAIRNE.

NOTICES

I. AN INTRODUCTION TO KANT'S PHILOSOPHY. By Norman Clark. London: Methuen, 1925. 10s. 6d.

II. ST. THOMAS AQUINAS. Edited by Rev. C. Lattey, S.J. (M.A., OXON.). Summer School of Catholic Studies. W. Heffer and Sons. 7s. 6d.

I.—AN INTRODUCTION TO KANT'S PHILOSOPHY.

Anyone who is ambitious enough to desire to offer more than a mere lip-service to philosophy is sooner or later faced with the task of reading the *Critique of Pure Reason*. It is probably true to say that no work in philosophy has done more to kill the aspirations of would-be students of philosophy than Kant's epoch-making production. Theological students being constantly reminded of Kant in their reading and in their lectures are at last in desperation driven to look at the works of the great man. With what result? Over and over again they put down the *Critique of Pure Reason* after the perusal of a few pages with the feeling that, whatever the experience of the more gifted may be, philosophy is not for them. The pages of Kant convey no meaning to them. All is obscure. Somewhat hastily they conclude that philosophy is too difficult. Hence the reiterated assertion over and over again: "I am not a philosopher. The subject is too deep for me." Hence, also, we fear, arises that neglect of the study of philosophy which is one of the outstanding weaknesses of our Anglican priests. What is the remedy? First to console themselves with the reflection that the difficulty in reading Kant is not wholly due to their own inherent inability to become philosophers, but is certainly in part due to Kant's own fault. He was, as many affirm, quite unnecessarily obscure in his presentation of his philosophical system, and this obscurity is not helped by the fact that so many read his works in translations. Secondly, to remind themselves that in these days there are many admirable outline sketches of the main principles of his philosophy, ranging from mere sketches to an exhaustive commentary such as that for which all Kantian students must be ever grateful to Dr. Kemp Smith. Thirdly, that if we want an introduction to Kant's philosophy, which aims at providing us with an exposition that comes between the exhaustive commentary and the short sketch, Mr. Norman Clark provides us with just the book needed to stimulate us to a fresh effort. After reading Mr. Norman Clark's *Introduction*, we can go back to the *Critique of Pure*

Reason with a new hope that under his guidance we shall be able to understand what we read and rise up from our study with a new-born confidence.

If Mr. Norman Clark's work proves to be the means by which many students can thus become in this sense post-Kantians with a hopeful future before them in the study of the works of modern philosophers, he will have rendered no mean service to students of philosophy in general, and to theological students in particular.

II.—St. Thomas Aquinas.

The action of Leo XIII., the initiator of the official Thomist revival, in his encyclical *Æterni Patris*, was the signal for a return to the study of St. Thomas Aquinas and has had far-reaching results in a renewed interest in scholasticism. The Pope's exhortation "to restore the wisdom of St. Thomas and propagate it far and wide" has borne fruit, not only in the Leonine edition of the works of the Angelic Doctor, but also in a renewed effort on the part of Christian students to submit themselves to the discipline of a painstaking and conscientious training in what it is maintained is "the best school of reasoning"—viz., the study of the *Summa Theologica*. The subject of the Papers for the Summer School of Catholic Studies held at Cambridge (August 4-9, 1924) was St. Thomas Aquinas, and we now have in convenient book form in these papers valuable prolegomena for the study of St Thomas's doctrine.

The Papers cover a wide range. There is one on the study of the *Summa Theologica*, in which the writer is at pains to stress, not only the value of this great work in itself, but also its didactic qualities. This is a point sometimes overlooked by those who question the wisdom of so much time being spent upon a work which, whatever its worth as a theological treatise, is none the less so far remote from modern thought as to render it at best only of historical interest. A persual of the papers shows that, in the opinion of the lecturers at this Summer School, St. Thomas is by no means so far removed from our modern world as some have too hastily concluded. Dr. Aveling, for example, in two able papers on "St. Thomas and Modern Thought," shows that the great Doctor, in his psychology, is in closer touch with our modern thought than in his physical science, and that, whilst most of his physics has gone and is now replaced by something else, there are many matters with regard to which psychologists appear to be returning from their painstaking empirical analyses towards a position at which, in its general features, no synthesis more than his is likely to be acceptable. But, apart from this question of the relative or absolute value of the *Summa Theologica* as a treatise, it is still possible to agree with Bishop Janssens when he points out that the most fundamental quality of St. Thomas is the admirable sequence of thought presented by his teaching. Even those, he says, who do not regard as demonstrated several theses which St. Thomas affirms, and who feel a greater or less esteem, as the case may be, for his system as a whole, recognize none the less the masterly skill with which he builds his edifice—let us say his cathedral—and the art wherewith he delights to adorn it, even in its least details. It is because of this that the use of St. Thomas is the best school of reasoning. Moreover, many will agree with the contention that his style is the most eloquent confirmation of Boileau's lines:

> "Ce qui se conçoit bien, s' énonce clairèment,
> Et les mots pur le dire arrivènt aisément.

Again, another classical advantage of the *Summa*, provided only that it be read in Latin, is that it introduces the reader to all the ample and beautiful literature of the past.

In the light of this and other valuable results which ensue, we can well endorse the wisdom of Pope Pius X. in recommending the study of the *Summa* in the original text:

> "We will, order and command that in the universities, larger academies, colleges, seminaries, and institutes which in virtue of an apostolic indult have the power of conferring academic degrees, and the doctorate in sacred theology, those who occupy chairs of sacred theology have the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas for the text of their lectures, and explain it in Latin: and that they take great pains that their hearers be very well affected towards it."

The advice which Bishop Janssens gives (p. 26 *ff*) regarding the manner in which the *Summa Theologica* should be employed is well worth the careful attention of all students of St. Thomas's works. It is refreshing to be reminded that "the most genuine Thomist, is not he who displays the most servile attachment to the letter of the holy doctor, but he who endeavours to penetrate so far into his method and into his thought as best to divine, in regard to the questions wherein progress is evidently possible, what St. Thomas would say to-day, availing himself of the results established by science since the time in which he lived."

An interesting paper on the Autograph of St. Thomas, a study of his moral, social and political philosophy, a searching comparison of St. Thomas and Aristotle, a study of his ascetical and mystical teaching, are, amongst other papers, devoted to this attempt to do justice to the many-sided character of his thought. Papers on Dante, the Poet of St. Thomas, and the Liturgical Poetry of St. Thomas, are in keeping with the subject the Summer School had before it—viz., the study of "The Times of St. Thomas," whilst a curious paper consisting mainly of quotations from the works of St. Thomas attempts to throw light upon St. Thomas and the Reunion of Christendom.

We have no hesitation in commending this volume to all those who are attracted by the revival of interest in Scholasticism.

H. Maurice Relton.

The History of the London Charterhouse. By Sir William St. John Hope. Pp. xi. + 203, with ten plates and two plans. S.P.C.K. 25s. net.

The deservedly high reputation of the late Sir William Hope as an authority on monastic buildings will ensure this posthumous work of his a warm welcome from the discerning. It is to be regretted that he did not live to put the finishing touches to it, for although the piety of Lady Hope and the care of Mr. Hamilton Thompson have enabled it to appear as a finished whole, it is really only the torso of a larger book. It brings the history of the Charterhouse down from its foundation to its dissolution, and thus stops short of the architecturally interesting period when part of it was metamorphosed into a private dwelling and inhabited by Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk.

The basis of the book is the fifteenth-century chartulary, long forgotten and only recently transferred with the Land Revenue records to the Public Record Office. This was used by Dr. Davies for his *Charterhouse*

in London, but has not hitherto been fully published. Sir William Hope has translated the whole of the introductory matter and subjoined the Latin text, adding elucidatory letterpress and footnotes, as well as some of the more important deeds registered in it. He brings out very fully the large share which Michael de Northburgh, Bishop of London, had in the foundation. A most interesting chapter deals with the founders of the separate cells and the spiritual experiences of some of their occupants. To this is added the substance of the author's paper, printed in *Archæologia*, on the ancient plan of the water-supply of the house, from which valuable conclusions are drawn as to the ground-plan of the original buildings. This is supplemented by a copy of the return of Henry VIII.'s commissioners of the ornaments and fittings taken over at the suppression, and the account of the keeper put in by them of his dealings with the property in his charge. It is curious to note that the monks, who escaped martyrdom by the surrender of their house, were permitted to take away, not only their personal property, but even the wainscoting of their cells. There are one or two regrettable oversights, such as the description of Margaret Marshal in a footnote and in the index as the widow of John, Lord "Seymour," and we should have liked more adequate biographies of Michael de Northburgh and of John of Northampton, as well as a street map showing the position of the property and a complete ground-plan of the buildings, distinguishing what still exists from what has been restored from the waterworks plan. For the general appearance of the book and its illustrations we have nothing but praise, but we must not pay compliments to our own publishers.

CHARLES JOHNSON.

THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA: A MEMORIAL FOR ITS SIXTEENTH CENTENARY. By A. E. Burn, D.D. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

This book says frankly and lucidly just what was needed to be said about Nicæa and its Creed, neither exonerating nor exaggerating. One had begun to fear that so much emphasis was being laid upon the decisions of the Three Hundred and Eighteen Fathers as to suggest that the Deity of the Son of God was scarcely recognized in the teaching of the Church before the year 325. In some recent commemorations too much importance was attached to the recitation of another formulary, misnamed Nicene, as though it were the original and inspired work of the Council. Dr. Burn writes wisely, and with a wider outlook. He shows the value of the Creed for the needs of that time, and also its inadequacy for excluding future errors, Pneumatomachian, Apollinarian, Nestorian, Eutychian, Monophysite, and Monothelite. Notwithstanding the criticisms of Lebedeff, Gibson, and Badcock, Dr. Burn supports in the main Dr. Hort's account of the "Creed of the One Hundred and Fifty," strengthened as Hort's position has since been by the researches of Dr. Burn himself, and Kunze and Kattenbusch. The framework of the Nicene formulary was Cæsarean, whereas the basis of "Our Nicene Creed," as Dr. Burn calls it, was the revised Cyrilline Creed of Jerusalem, which is "Nicene" only in the sense that it incorporates the all-important "Homoousion." The actual Nicene formulary was a specially devised document drawn up with special intention to exclude Arian error, and was propounded as a test of orthodoxy for subscription by the Bishops assembled. It was never used, or meant to be used, as a Baptismal Confession nor as a liturgical Profession of

Faith for clergy or laity. Dr. Burn's marshalling of the evidence of the Latin MSS. as to the insertion of the *Filioque* in Spanish creeds is particularly clear. The interest of the book is enhanced by a facsimile (and translation) of a papyrus letter of Athanasius to the monk Paphnutius in the middle of the fourth century (P. Lond. 1929). Misprints appear on pages 33 (read "Word"), 93 (read "revised"), 126 (read "oblivious").

T. HERBERT BINDLEY.

THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE UP TO THE END OF THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY HISTORICALLY AND DOGMATICALLY CONSIDERED. By Ernest Jauncey, D.D. S.P.C.K. 14s.

Dr. Jauncey's preface well describes the general character of the book. He has aimed at supplying "primarily for the use of the rather advanced student" a textbook on the subject of Grace, "giving a historical and doctrinal outline of the whole dogma." Within these limits the book deserves commendation. The student will find a large amount of material carefully collected and accurately summarized. Chapter IV., on the teaching of the Early Church, is specially well done. In the last chapter there is a very full treatment of the Pelagian controversy that should be most helpful. But at this point we are pulled up sharp. Semi-pelagianism is reserved for a second volume, which, it is hoped, will carry on the treatment of the subject down to modern times. The fact that this volume is only the first half of the whole work makes it difficult to judge it fairly. The book is good enough to make us wish it were better. Dr. Jauncey's treatment is always conservative and often conventional. We wonder whether he has really got behind the old controversies to the vital problems, and escaped the danger of substituting traditional phrases for clear thinking. He makes no attempt to relate the teaching, say of St. Paul, to modern knowledge, with the result that his treatment must appear to the student to have only an antiquarian interest. For instance, on p. 18 he seems to assume that Genesis gives us historical knowledge "of what *man was as God made him.*" Nor can we assign any intelligible meaning to the assertion on p. 4 that "Grace is . . . the means of retrieving the injury done to us and more especially *by* us in the Fall." Again, he is careful to point out the faults of Pelagius, but we look in vain for any appreciation of the truths which he championed, however confusedly. As he remarks, the Church has never accepted the full Augustinian position. And St. Augustine's own teaching on certain points deserves far more definite criticism than it receives. Perhaps, however, such comments are unfair, and what is lacking will be supplied in the second volume. We hope to find there an exposition of Grace as, above all, a personal relationship between the soul and God, a fuller recognition of its social nature, as mediated through the Christian community, and a frank consideration of the bearing of modern science and psychology upon the whole problem. If Dr. Jauncey can give us these, he will meet the needs of a far wider circle than students preparing for examinations.

E. J. BICKNELL.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER.